THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

VOL. XLV. No. 265 JULY, 1942

The Christian Ministry - - - *H. Cunliffe-Jones*
The Interim Report on Training for the Ministry - - - - - *Glyn Simon*
The Church and the Countryside - *A. C. Scupholme*
Revised Reviews: No. 17 Mansel's Bampton Lectures - - *W. W. S. March*
The Theological Problem in Mr. Emlyn Williams - - - *H. G. Emmet*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

1s. 6d. per copy. 15s. per annum, post free.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester. (MSS should not exceed 4,000 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)
Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Advisory Committee

The Rev. Canon F. A. Cockin.
The Rev. L. J. Collins.
The Rev. F. L. Cross, D.Phil.
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.
Ashley Sampson.

Collaborators

(The following are in general sympathy with the aims of *Theology* and are willing in various ways to give it their assistance, but they are not committed by the editorial policy in particular matters.)

The Rev. H. K. Archdall.
Montgomery Belgion.
The Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D.
Prof. T. S. R. Boase.
F. Brittain.
Leonard Browne, M.D.
Miss K. E. Chester.
The Rev. A. A. Cock.
The Rev. F. N. Davey.
The Rev. H. S. Deighton.
E. W. Edmonds.
T. S. Eliot.
Miss D. M. Emmet.
Bro. George Every, S.S.M.
The Rev. A. M. Farrer.
The Rev. S. L. Greenslade.
The Rev. Prof. L. W. Grensted, D.D.
The Rev. H. StJ. Hart.
The Rev. H. C. L. Heywood.
The Rev. Prof. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys.
The Rev. Canon W. L. Knox, B.D.
The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton.
The Very Rev. the Provost of Leicester.
C. S. Lewis.
The Rev. Prof. R. H. Lightfoot, D.D.
The Rev. Ronald Lunt.
Donald Mackinnon.
The Rev. Prof. F. S. Marsh.
The Rev. E. L. Mascall.
The Rev. Guy Mayfield.
The Rev. T. R. Milford.
J. Middleton Murry.
The Rev. Arnold Nash, M.Sc.
Joseph Needham, Sc.D., F.R.S.
The Rev. A. Otter.
The Rev. Prof. O. C. Quick, D.D.
The Rev. Prof. A. M. Ramsey.
The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff.
The Rev. Alan Richardson, B.D.
Michael Roberts.
The Very Rev. the Dean of St Paul's.
The Rev. George Seaver, B.D.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Sheffield.
John Short.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.
The Rev. A. M. Stockwood.
The Rev. Prof. R. V. G. Tasker, B.D.
Miss B. Hamilton Thompson.
The Rev. Oliver Tomkins.
The Rev. C. D. Waddams.
Gilbert N. Walton.
The Rev. M. A. C. Warren.
Charles Williams.
The Headmaster of Winchester.

Editorial Representatives in U.S.A. (to whom MSS and communications from American writers should be sent):

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, New York.
The Very Rev. Powel M. Dawley, Ph.D., The Deanery, Portland, Maine.

Collaborators in U.S.A.

Prof. George R. Elliott, Litt.D.
The Rev. Canon John Crocker. [S.T.D.
The Very Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke,
The Rev. Leicester C. Lewis, S.T.D
The Rev. Charles W. Lowry, D.Phil.
Prof. William A. Orton.
Allen Tate.

Other Representatives Abroad:

Ireland: The Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, B.D., Trinity College, Dublin.
South Africa: The Rev. C. H. S. Runge, C.R., Rosettenville, Johannesburg.
N. India: The Rev. J. R. Peacey, Bishop's College, Calcutta.
S. India: The Ven. T. G. Stuart Smith, C.M.S., Tholashery, Tiruvalla, Travancore.
Australia: The Rev. G. Stuart Watts, 90 Pitt Street, Sydney.
Canada: The Rev. R. K. Naylor, Diocesan Theological College, Montreal.
New Zealand: The Rev. W. M. Davies, College House, Christchurch.

THEOLOGY

VOL. XLV JULY, 1942 No. 265

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE articles in this number deal with the Ministry of the Church from various aspects, but they are not addressed to the clergy alone. All believers can sharpen the sense of their own priesthood by seriously reflecting upon the calling of the ordained priesthood, and at a time when the latter has lost its traditional status in society and its future status is very uncertain, there is thinking to be done around its foundations in which clergy and laity must co-operate.

* * * * *

The publication of the Interim Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Training for the Ministry brings many questions to a head; or at least they crop up. We welcome its publication, the boldness of its proposals, and also the fact that it is an *Interim* Report. This means, we take it, that before concluding its work the Commission is ready to reconsider, amplify, or alter its recommendations in the light of comment and criticism, of which already a considerable amount has appeared. For our part we are disposed to suspend judgment until fuller information is available as to what is intended. We hope that the Final Report will do justice to the general questions which are raised in the paper by Professor Cunliffe-Jones, for very much depends on how these are answered. In particular, it seems unfortunate that the Commission should have recommended the concentration of theological training at the universities without at the same time indicating its attitude to the problem to which attention is drawn on p. 9. The Commission will in fact need to determine its attitude to the important issues that were discussed in David Paton's *Blind Guides?* (1939) and Adolf Löwe's *The Universities in Transformation* (1940). Universities are in need of constructive criticism as well as theological colleges.

The Christian Ministry

"If a Church wishes to show its self-respect," said P. T. Forsyth, "it will go out of its way to be respectful to its ministry. The Church will be what its ministry makes it. That stands to reason. The Church is made by its gospel, and the gospel is the special trust of the ministry within the Church as it is of the Church within the world." If that is true, then the right understanding of the nature and function of the ministry is the concern not only of all ministers of the Word and Sacraments but of all who care for the well-being of the Church of Christ. This article is written as the result of a small conference between a group of Anglican, Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist and Presbyterian theological teachers, in order to share our pressing concern with a wider audience. It is hoped that any readers of THEOLOGY who are themselves concerned, are anxious to probe issues to which we may be blind, or have light to shed on the path ahead, will communicate their convictions to us.

Out of the Tambaram meeting of the International Missionary Council in December 1938 there sounded a moving plea for closer co-operation on the part of the older Churches. Few would admit to being deaf to that plea, yet the important steps that are immediately possible are not taken. It is simply astonishing that there are no official channels whereby the theological teachers of this country can have regular consultation with one another either upon the specific subjects entrusted to them or upon the work of the ministry for which the training is given. There are of course personal contacts, a certain amount of local co-operation, and the reading of published works. But these are no substitute for regular consultation and discussion. In the way of such practical co-operation stands no question of theological principle, nothing except inertia.

No one can hope to state all the questions which the Christian Church ought to have been putting to itself regarding the nature and function of the ministry at a time like the present. Yet all the relevant questions, known and unknown, may be grouped in certain ways which do not impede the attainment of more searching, fuller, and more concrete insight. There are three lines of inquiry, continually interpenetrating one another, which may focus our unsatisfied concern for the Christian ministry. In the first place

we may seek to apprehend again with a new depth and intensity the essential nature and function of the Christian ministry; in the second place we may seek to apprehend with the utmost possible concreteness the response which the ministry ought to be making to the life of the world, especially in relation to the local community in which the Churches stand; and in the third place we may seek to learn the lessons which the fact of the world-wide Church and the experience of the mission field (as crystallized especially in the Tambaram series of volumes) can make available, and the new perspective which they give to the problems of the home ministry.

One small question may be noted in passing. It would further co-operative discussion on the tasks of the ministry if there was reasonable agreement as to what are the great works dealing with the Christian ministry coming from the main types of Christian witness with which the instructed Christian ought to familiarize himself. What names and titles ought to be added to or deleted from the following list: St. Ambrose, *De Officiis* ; St Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio* ; St Gregory the Great, *Regulæ Pastoralis Liber* ; John Owen, *The Duty of Pastors and People Distinguished* ; Richard Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor* ; George Herbert, *A Priest to the Temple* ; H. E. Manning, *The Eternal Priesthood* ; R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood?* Also, what suggestions can be made for a short list of biographies of the best examples of the different ministerial traditions which every Christian ought to know?

(1) *What is the nature and function of the Christian ministry?*

The ultimate question the facing of which would give a greater reality to inter-denominational discussion is that of *Authority*. Indeed, this is the ultimate question concerning the life of the Church—either in its own apprehension of what it means to be the Church, or in the understanding of men outside the Church of what the Church is doing. Is the authority of the Church from Heaven or from men? It ought at least to be clear in a shattering century like the present that to base the life of the Church on purely utilitarian considerations is to produce that abomination of desolation a bureaucratic Church in a bureaucratic state. The Church must live by its God-given faith. The crucial issue of authority may appear differently to many people. I can only suggest some of the questions. What is the nature of

that Gospel on which the Church is dependent and with which it is entrusted? What is the essential nature of Church Order in its witness to the Gospel? What are the credentials of the Apostolic Ministry? Who is entitled to speak with authority on behalf of the Church of a district—is it the diocesan bishop as such or is it the representatives of Churches gathered in Synod? Perhaps the question capable of most fruitful discussion is that concerning the nature of the Apostolic Ministry. None of the main types of Christian witness would repudiate the claim to possess the Apostolic Ministry, though some have not honoured the claim, some have departed grievously from the faith of apostles and prophets, and all need to ponder anew the nature of that authority under which the Church and the ministry of the Church are set free to serve mankind in obedience to Christ.

When once we have acknowledged Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Lord—and, "if Christ be not God," said John Owen (1616-1683), a grand old Congregationalist, "farewell to Christianity—as to the mystery, the glory, the truth, the efficacy of it! Let a refined heathenism be established in its room"—we can rightly understand His work in terms of the traditional classification as that of Prophet, Priest, and King. The prophetic, priestly, and kingly character belongs firstly to Christ; thence the same or complementary functions may be ascribed to the Church which is His Body; and thence further to the ministry of the Church. In the first place, the minister is prophet—and the question is, how can we recover conviction in the essentially prophetic character of the ministry? It is important to be clear what we mean by the prophetic word in this connexion. It is fatally easy when the life of the Church is divorced from its Biblical foundations to think of a prophetic word as that which offers a "religious" solution to urgent human distresses; whereas the prophetic character of the Christian ministry consists in forthtelling that word of God resting on the faith of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone, and in making real to a particular situation the message of God in judgment and salvation through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. (Karl Barth, whatever criticisms he may be open to, is a convenient example of the latter type; for the former I have in mind the widespread habit of expressing in Christian language conceptions which treat God simply as a means to

the well-being of man, and are based essentially not on the Gospel but on the " liberal " view of man, the British tradition, the Atlantic Charter, modern psychology, the usefulness of reunion, etc.) One necessary means to the recovery of conviction in the essentially prophetic character of the ministry is the restoration to the ministry and to the body of faithful Christians of belief in the Bible as the Word of God. This is not a plea for fundamentalism, it is simply a recognition of the fact that valuable and necessary as literary and historical commentaries are, they are no substitute for theological and practical ones. For want of these latter there is a spiritual hunger among humble Christians that cannot be appeased. The Bible has been treated in every other way than as the standard and rule of Christian faith. Unless the Bible is the witness to that Word of God on which our whole salvation depends, and unless ministers and Christian people generally can understand this Word, obey, and live by it, the doom of the Christian Church is very near.

Secondly, the minister is priest—and the question is, how can the Church perform its essentially priestly function in reconciling men to God ? The priesthood of the Christian ministry is derived from Christ the Eternal High Priest who gives its fundamentally priestly character to the Church—the one body in which all are reconciled to God. The priesthood of all believers and their active share in the evangelistic work of the Church are not denied but affirmed in the organic and representative functions which the minister performs on behalf of the whole Body. But how is the ministry to fulfil its reconciling activity in a world which does not know itself as sinful and where men have no desire to be reconciled to God ? " The passion to save souls " may be given a falsely individualist meaning, but in its true meaning it is the heart of the Christian ministry. Until we have agonized more than we have done over the frustration of the work of the ministry in the reconciliation of men and women to God, we shall not understand the call of God at this time. Some things, of course, are always possible. The Church must abide with its Lord in the work of intercession for a sinful world, and it has received authority to declare the forgiveness of God to those who cleave to Him in faith and repentance.

Thirdly, as Christ is King and Shepherd of His people, so ministers are His servants, under His authority, who exercise pastoral care and discipline in His name; and the

question is, how can the minister fulfil his pastoral office, and what is his relation to others in the community—*e.g.*, the doctor, the schoolmaster, the social worker, who, in part at least, may fulfil the same function ? The first question that occurs in connexion with the pastoral work of the ministry is what was called of old catechizing. It is the question of education in the life of the Christian Church, and if we could come to a true understanding of what ought to be done with the adult Christian in this regard, we should be in a better position to know what to do with the children who, we hope, will grow up into adult Christians. This is one of the many questions on which light may be gained by pondering the experience of the mission field. George Herbert wrote in 1632: " The Country Parson values catechizing highly: for there being three points of his duty; the one, to infuse a competent knowledge of salvation in every one of his flock; the other, to multiply and build up this knowledge to a spiritual temple; the third, to inflame this knowledge, to press and drive it to practice, turning it to reformation of life, by pithy and lively exhortations." What is the equivalent of this catechizing in 1942 ?

This raises also the question of visiting and whether the Christian minister has such a conception of this task as shall result today in the edification of the Church, the restoration of the half-hearted, and the evangelization of the indifferent. Here the minister must see to it that his people do not rest content with external membership but are impelled and enabled to grow in grace. With this too is allied the question of discipline and whether the Christian minister knows what kind of discipline he ought to exercise, and how he ought to exercise it in order that the Church may be kept walking in faithful obedience to Christ. The second part of the question concerning the pastoral office, the relation of the Christian minister to others in the community exercising partly similar functions, is even more difficult. For its answer it demands an understanding of the extent to which the community in which we live is not a community, of the nature of true community and the relation of the Gospel to it, and of the differentiation of Christian functions within the community. It is at least clear that the pastoral attitude to life is not only the special responsibility of a particular group or profession, but one that is obligatory on all mankind unless our own life is to grow corrupt. Unless we are concerned for the highest well-being of our neighbour

we shall not live our own lives in peace. Further, especially under present social conditions, the greatest opportunities of carrying out the pastoral office of the Christian Church may be given to those not called to the official ministry, and Christian ministers must be prepared to learn about their own opportunities from those who in the course of their life's work have special experience in personal dealing with men and women.

(2) *What should be the response of the Christian ministry to the life of the world?*

This question is interwoven with the previous one, and is so vast as to tempt us to take refuge from the nakedness of our own wisdom in saying and doing nothing. We must first take seriously the secularization of the life of the Church. We often complain that the ministry and the Church in general are out of touch with the life of the world, but this is only a symptom of the much deeper malady that the Church is deeply infected with worldliness, with the thoughts, desires and standards of the secularized age in which we live. The recovery of fellowship and mutual understanding between different sections of society is not to be attained simply by getting together. It is only when the Church in every place is full of the Holy Ghost and of power, that it can re-establish that personal contact between the Church and the world which is effective unto salvation. In the second place the Christian Church, living in the power of the eternal purpose of God, must measure what it does by the perspective of the centuries, instead of what can be sown and reaped within the narrow span of a single life. For the healing of our present distresses there are many insights which need to be recovered from centuries past and made elements in the constructive thinking of the present. (For example, we all need to draw new inspiration from the insights of the seventeenth century; and in the recovery of a living Christian social tradition many periods will provide elements of inspiration.) And in response to the need of the world the Church must dare, in faith in the patience of God, to make the beginnings of ways of thought and action the fruits of which the present generation will never see. In the third place, with the perspective of the centuries the Christian Church must combine the sense of the intense urgency of our time. Because neither the Church nor the world has walked in faithfulness with God, the results of our

sins are everywhere upon us to our confusion, and the vast technological powers in the hands of the modern state make the prospect of the structure of society hardening in lines which frustrate true community an ever-present danger. The ministry of the Church cannot fulfil its task in cloistered calm, but in greater faithfulness with increasing awareness of the dangers threatening the life of society, and of what it means for the Church of Christ to be set in such a society. It is of the greatest urgency that Christian people everywhere be taught to discriminate in the present situation those things by which alone the community can be a community (*e.g.*, the public acknowledgment of a common end not incompatible with the chief end of man, the transformation of the institutions of the community so that they serve that end, and the widespread acceptance of the obligation on individuals to serve and sacrifice for the sake of that end), and those things by which alone the Church can be the Church of Christ (*e.g.*, the acceptance of its life as dependent on God-given faith, the reformation of the structure of its life by the Word of God so that it expresses this faith, and the readiness to witness in concrete situations as a testimony to this faith), so that real witness may be borne and evils averted in the mercy of God. In the fourth place, in so far as this concern should be expressed in the training for the Christian ministry, it would seem that it should be met not by the adding of extra subjects or courses to a full curriculum, but by the re-orientation of the traditional disciplines of Theology and Church History. We need a fuller recognition that the History of Christian Doctrine is but a preface to Constructive Theology, and that the scope of Theology covers not only the exposition of the Christian Faith but also of the Christian Life. And the Christian Life must be understood not only in its most intimate meaning or as a private, affair, but also in its most extensive and public sense taking account of the kind of limitations and distortions which the structure of society may impose upon Christians acting in groups or singly, and upon the life of mankind. The whole study and teaching of Church History needs a great rekindling, both to take account of the onward growth of the Christian Church reaching to our own times, and also to see the doctrine and practical decisions of the Church as influencing and being influenced by the whole complex of historical, sociological, political and economic factors in which its life was set.

(Here, perhaps, is the place to introduce, in parenthesis, the fact that the relation between theological colleges and universities needs reconsideration. The advantages to a theological college of association with a university are taken so much for granted that they need not be stressed here. But where a university in its Arts Course no longer communicates a unified perspective of life, where its theological courses, especially in Constructive Theology, are manifestly deficient, and where in the teaching given in Biblical subjects the main emphasis is not placed on the Bible as the Word of God, ought a theological college which cares deeply for the Christian ministry to entrust some of the most important teaching work to the university? The Church of England is, at least, not of one mind on the question. And in Nonconformist colleges, which developed under persecution in their Academies their own conception of education, there have arisen doubts as to whether they have accepted too uncritically the conception of education which obtains at universities, and whether they ought not to try to adapt their own sounder tradition to the conditions of the twentieth century. The point at issue here is not merely the maintenance of a disciplined devotional life among students preparing for the ministry; there would seem to be no insuperable difficulty about securing that at a hostel in a university; but rather the difference between a *theological* study, not only of the Bible, but of human history and human nature, and such study of them as obtains, and alone can obtain, at a secular university. It is clear that the relation between theological colleges and universities cannot simply be taken for granted.)

In the fifth place, the right response of the Christian ministry to the life of the world must be tested out by responsible and courageous experiment. Such experiments, happily, are taking place (*e.g.*, the Iona Community in Scotland); the pity is, not that they are started by individual initiative in particular groups, but that they are not made known more widely and evaluated in relation to the Christian ministry as a whole. There is the problem of the desirability of specialized ministries; of group ministries; of mobile ministries on a celibate basis for a limited period; of ministries adapted to particular sections of the community, and so on. We need more information and a common judgment.

In general, it may be said in answer to the question, "what should be the response of the Christian ministry to the life of

the world?" that the duty of the Christian minister is to build up the Body of Christ and to enable the Body of Christ to give life to the community. The function of the minister is to be the leader of his Church's witness—to witness himself directly is in many cases much easier than to enable his Church to give its Christian witness. If the minister is to do this, he must do more than instruct it in the fundamentals of Christian faith, the maintenance of the life of prayer, and the elements of moral decision; he must evoke and train in its members evangelistic power, and help them to become aware of the most important issues in the life of the community in which the Church stands. There is a distressing testimony to the fact that Christian people at the present time concentrate on matters of secondary importance—*e.g.*, temperance, gambling, non-observance of Sunday—even when the local community is deeply concerned over something which affects its whole life (*e.g.*, W. G. Symons in an article entitled "Gnats and Camels" in *Straightway* (Independent Press), second quarter, 1942, draws two pictures. One is of an East Midland village at the height of a conflict between political and non-political trade unions, where the public issues in relation to which the total Christian population were concerned to witness were drink and the selling of ice-cream and the running of rail excursions on Sunday. The other is of a big modern city where Christian business men were more concerned to discuss the Sunday delivery of bread than the ruthlessness of modern industry). What is necessary is that not only the Church but also the community shall be helped to understand what the community means in the light of the glory of God. This is a difficult task which provokes much opposition both inside and outside the Church. Action must combine facing all the fundamental issues of community life, however complicated and abstract they may be, with practical experiments of a limited character in particular situations, and a persistent endeavour to bridge the gap between the two.

(3) *What light is shed on the work of the home ministry from the mission field?*

The Christian ministry has always been the ministry of the Universal Church of Christ, and those ministries whose authority and validity have been most challenged have always claimed to be ministries of the Universal Church and

have been so regarded by the classic exponents of the theories underlying them. But today a new fact has come into being the implications of which are not fully realized. In spite of the unfinished task of evangelization the Church of Christ now actually exists as a world-wide entity. Here there are two points to be considered—on the one hand the field is the world and the world is one; on the other hand the divisions of the Church are of less importance than its unity of witness to Jesus Christ crucified and risen. Every part of the world-wide Church suffers from the worldliness and lack of faith of every other part. We must accept the opportunity thus presented without sentimentality. The world contains a multitude of Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant Christians. In so far as we acknowledge that they witness to the true nature of Christ's Church we must be prepared both to give to them and to learn from them, and not be content with those contacts which are easiest for us to make. Further, the relation between older and younger Churches is not that of giving and receiving but of mutual interdependence. And in the hour of trial who knows in what section of the globe the degradation and shame of the Christian Church will be seen, and in what section the manifestation of the grace of God in Christian leadership of the nations will be visible ?

If this is true, we must understand the missionary enterprise as the story of that outreach of the Christian Gospel which is the heart of the life of the Church. The Christian ministry must be for the service of that world-wide Church wherever it can most fittingly be used. There will remain great differences between men who serve in countries whose predominant religion, culture, and standard of life differ largely from their own and those who do not, but it is right that the ministry of the Christian Church should have the greatest possible detachment from its immediate environment so that it can be used with the greatest effect. We need a ministry trained in the true understanding of Church history—on the one hand to have a vivid awareness of the spreading growth of the Christian Church from country to country down the centuries, and not least the vast expansion of the Christian Church during the last 150 years; and on the other hand to understand the vital issues of contemporary Church history, the situation of the world-wide Church in the twentieth century. It is important to send men into the Christian ministry with a knowledge of the formative and

crucial epochs of Christian history; but also we can no longer afford to send men into the ministry ignorant of the immediate past of the Christian Church in any part of the world.

Ever since I came back from the meeting of the International Missionary Council at Tambaram, Madras, in December 1938, I have been anxious that a concerted study should be made of the light which the Tambaram series of volumes might shed on the work of the home ministry. Indeed, in very many ways I believe the home ministry has much more to learn from the experience of the mission field than it has to give. It is partly that on the mission field the burden of the non-Christian world presses more heavily; it is partly that the need for new experimental methods is inescapably obvious, and there is not the same temptation to cling to established ways which " may last out our time "; it is partly that the need for feeding, training, guiding the adult Christian is more easily taken for granted. Of course, the solutions to problems of the home ministry are not simply given on the mission field—what is given is starting points for constructive endeavour. But this is something more than a temper of mind. It concerns concrete situations such as evangelism, religious education, the relation of institutions to the life of the Church, and the practice of co-operative work. One element in the true perspective of the home ministry must be given by a first-hand study of the missionary enterprise.

Is the Christian Church thinking those thoughts about its own ministry which are adequate to the eternal purpose of God for such a time as this? This article seeks to sharpen the question which is long overdue for an answer. To meet it we urgently need a greater sharing of such light as God has seen fit to give us.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

The Archbishops' Commission on Training for the Ministry—Interim Report

An Outside View

Any sign that the Church of England is taking steps to deal with the training of her ministry cannot but be welcome to her friends. It is welcome not only on general

grounds, but because it cannot fail to have been noticed that her ministry is ceasing to be mainly a graduate one, and because for at least ten years we in Wales have been aware that time and time again men who have been refused ordination here have been ordained in England without any difficulty, often without serious inquiry. In my own experience I recollect, amongst others, the ordination in England of a man who was rejected in Wales because he was mentally unstable, of another who was morally unsound (this in spite of an episcopal telegram of warning), of a third whose college record was in all respects deplorable, and of a fourth who had been neither to a university nor to a theological college, but had done a little lay-reading in a small country parish, in the rectory of which he sat and passed both parts of G.O.E., though he was so definitely Welsh that he would certainly not have been able to write and speak that "idiomatic and intelligible English" which the Commission so rightly demands. It is clear that some drastic steps are necessary in connexion with training for the ministry in England; the Commission was called into being none too soon, and it is to be hoped that if, and when, its final report is issued and agreed upon, the Episcopate can be counted on to stand firmly by its principles.

In any scheme such as the report contemplates two most important questions will be the recruitment of candidates, and finance; as both of these are to be left to the final report not much can be said about them at this stage. But enough appears in the interim report to raise serious doubts as to whether the immense cost of the proposed schemes has been adequately faced. Not only is there the capital outlay on the theological halls, which are an integral part of the scheme (some idea of the outlay required may be gathered from the fact that the new men's hostels being erected by the University of Wales, out of moneys received from the Welsh Church Commissioners, cost £60,000 to £70,000 each for hostels for about sixty men), but there is also the fact that so far as can be seen the type of candidate coming forward is likely to be one more and more in need of complete financial support. In Wales we have been accustomed to this type of candidate for many years—the Bangor Clerical Education Committee was founded as long ago as 1884—and the need of help is increasing rather than diminishing. It must not be forgotten that many ordinands, at least in modern universities, live with students who are going to

be teachers, the whole cost of whose training is borne by the State. With the best will in the world, will the parents of the future be able to afford to send their sons to the ministry in the face of economic stress, especially if their progress in their career is likely to be suspended, for example, while they acquire a satisfactory knowledge of the Bible? (See p. 8, para. 2, and p. 16, para. 2.) In spite of its stress upon "the needs of the present day," it seems doubtful whether the Commission is itself fully aware of them, at least in their economic bearing upon the training of the ministry of the future.

Our doubts about this awareness are strengthened when we consider the suggestions put forward in connexion with the establishment of "theological halls," to which graduates are to go for varying periods of theological study. We note that they are to be established at a "University with a Theological Faculty." But will not this, in fact, mean Oxford, Cambridge, London, Durham and Manchester only, for the other universities do not, as yet, possess faculties of theology? And is it desirable that when modern universities are becoming more and more important in the general educational and cultural life of the country, the study of theology by Anglican students should be in danger of being carried on at other centres of learning almost exclusively? Is there not here a real risk of the isolation of theology from one of the main educational streams of the country? (This danger seems to some in Wales a very real one, as the existence of St David's College, Lampeter, in complete separation from the University of Wales and the main intellectual and cultural life of Wales, does, in spite of its many advantages, tend to separate many of the clergy from some of the most significant national movements.) No doubt the Commission is aware of this danger, but the need for caution is very great; possibly an approach might be made to other denominations with colleges in or near provincial university centres with a view to the joint setting up of theological faculties. In the University of Wales such a faculty exists, and exists both as an encouragement and a warning: it is an encouragement as a sign of the changed attitude of a modern university towards the study of theology, a warning because of its strongly sectarian composition and control, which at present make it impossible to fit its courses into the Church's system of training for Holy Orders.

These theological halls form an essential part of the Commission's scheme of training, which seems to contemplate a six-year course as its average length, three or four years on a degree course, and two or three years in a hall. One wonders whether the halls are necessary at all, and whether all or even the majority of candidates are likely to profit by so long a time in an academic atmosphere. A disendowed Church such as the Church in Wales has to take careful account of its expenditure, and its example in this direction may well have to be followed more nearly, and sooner, by its richer neighbour than the Commission seems to realize. Why should not advantage be taken of the theological colleges already existing in university centres, to a much greater extent than is at present the case, for the kind of theological study envisaged by the Commission, combined with the devotional training provided by these colleges? This, together with a degree course, would cover five years, while in the sixth year the candidate might be admitted into the diaconate and pass this period in the various studies and ways indicated by the Commission: teaching practice, sociology, pastoralia and the like. Exceptional men might profit by the six-year course which the Commission has in mind, and the intellectual test which the Commission suggests for all candidates might well be adapted to find out men of this type. In the existing scheme of training for the ministry in Wales the most successful part has been a Welsh Church Scholarship Examination, which in the last few years has certainly succeeded in raising the intellectual level of our ordinands. In this examination, for which no syllabus is printed, a candidate sits three or four papers in a subject chosen by himself, a General knowledge paper, an essay, and a paper in Biblical knowledge; he is also examined *viva voce* by all the examiners. Six or seven scholarships are awarded each year, while the general number of entrants for them is between thirty and forty. As hardly any non-graduates are ordained in Wales matriculation forms a reasonably satisfactory intellectual test for the non-scholarship candidates, while the Scholarship Examination does succeed in finding out the type of candidate likely to benefit from a long academic course. The interim report seems here too rigid and narrow in its conception of the kind of training needed; any scheme which deals with persons must surely be capable of much more variety and elasticity and allow for far more varying

needs and capacities than that put forward by the Commission.

After the question of recruitment (on which the Commission's views will be awaited with interest) the most important question is that of selection of candidates. This is an unsatisfactory feature of training in Wales, and our own revisory sub-committee on training for the ministry, which reported in 1938, recommended nothing to improve it. Selection with us is often haphazard, too diocesan, and too impersonal; there are, of course, exceptions to this wide generalization, but, as a whole, it is true. The Archbishops' Commission gives a good deal of attention to this important question, and seeks to answer it by the provision of regional selection committees. These would, no doubt, do something to prevent selection on too haphazard or diocesan a basis, but they may even aggravate the impersonal defect. A faint air of unreality, which indeed overhangs the whole report, is particularly discernible here. Does the Commission realize the immense amount of time which the members of the committee will have to expend if they are to do their work properly? and where are men with the leisure and proper qualifications to be found? What does the Commission mean by "experienced laymen and women"? Experience as a doctor, a head of a women's college, a schoolmaster, or an army general, by no means carries with it the necessary qualifications for selecting candidates for Holy Orders. Some personal knowledge of more than one selection committee has often given me cause for wonder at the judgments and views in this connexion of some of the most eminent laymen and clergy, of real distinction and experience in other directions. Again, it seems inevitable, under the suggested method of selection, that the connexion of the Bishop with his candidates, already tenuous, will become even slighter. Of course a Bishop makes mistakes like everyone else, and in his selection of ordinands, as in other matters, needs both guidance and, if possible, control, but he does hold the highest office in the Church, and one of venerable antiquity and age-long associations, and his personal contact with all who wish to be ordained, from first to last, has values which a committee, however eminent, can never possess. Indeed, it is in the seeming lack of realization of the importance of the personal element that the Commission's suggestions for selection seem weakest. There is, however, a proposal, made by the Commission

itself, which may indicate a way in which this weakness can be remedied. On page 11, para. 2, it is proposed that each Bishop should " appoint one of his diocesan clergy to keep in touch with . . . ordinands and those provisionally accepted for ordination," etc. If such a priest could be given this appointment as his whole-time task (for not otherwise can it be efficiently discharged), possibly for a region rather than for a diocese, could be regarded as the direct representative of the Bishop, and directly associated with the work of the regional committee from the first, much more of the personal element in the work of selection, which is of vital importance, could be brought in. Training for the ministry in North Wales, in the two dioceses of Bangor and St Asaph, has for half a century been directly associated with the two Bishops, assisted by the clerical education committees, and a whole-time warden of ordinands, who is responsible for interviewing and making full inquiries of would-be candidates, as well as for supervising their training and visiting them while in college; and in spite of inevitable mistakes and certain local difficulties, it is more successfully managed there than seems to be generally the case elsewhere.

Space does not allow of more than a few words on other points in the report. Particularly welcome is the insistence on *post-ordination training*, to the need for which in Wales Dr Joyce, formerly Bishop of Monmouth, repeatedly called attention. The realization of the value of *non-graduates* in the ministry is also welcome, for we suffer, not only in Wales and not only ecclesiastically, from a too zealous attachment to the collecting of post-nominal letters. Nothing in the Commission's suggestions is more practical than that guidance and direction should be given to undergraduates in the choice of degree courses, for degrees are multiplied which conceal an ignorance far greater than the knowledge they test. " Parties " in the Church are far more highly developed in England than in Wales, and this may partly account for the Commission's attitude towards *theological colleges*; but here again the remedy seems to lie in improvement of what one has rather than in expensive demolition and removals. *Medical examinations* have had their place in all Welsh training schemes, but their value seems exaggerated, except possibly in cases of sight, speech or hearing, for tragedies of ill-health amongst the younger clergy do not seem any more or less common than they were in the days

before medical examinations; but these are relatively small points. It is the general impression which the report leaves that matters, and on one outside observer at least the impression left is of something too academic and unrealistic. In the second sentence of the report we read that it " presents in summary form the conclusions of the Commission . . . in particular on those matters which seem to call for *immediate* action " (italics mine). How strange, then, to read nothing at this stage on the truly urgent subject of recruitment and nothing on the equally urgent question of finance, and instead, to be provided with a scheme for the lavish provision of theological halls and the closing down or transporting of many valuable buildings and societies ! How unrealistic to propose this amongst the ruins of hundreds of churches, schools and halls, and thousands of homes ! How unrealistic to take for granted, as such schemes must, the survival of the Church of England in all her accustomed security and wealth ! How much more than unrealistic to suppose that a country can be won back to Christianity by a ministry trained as heretofore, but more intensively, on lines suitable, in the main, only to a Church whose task it is to build up rather than to convert ! It is the latter task which confronts, with increasing urgency, the Church of England. The interim report offers no assurance that the right weapons will be forthcoming with which to discharge it.

Glyn Simon.

The Church and the Countryside[1]

I

For some of us the country parishes are the happiest spheres of work which the Church of England affords. When the moment of our good fortune comes upon us, and we shake from our feet the dust of the town, we approach with pleasant anticipation our country benefice. We are about to leave the luckless acres, which have lost their beauty and their fertility in the disastrous course of industrial development; we are to leave that society which has gone far towards losing its humanity in the quest for riches; and to find, as we hope, fairer scenes, fertile fields, and saner

[1] The agricultural conditions mentioned in this article refer especially to the Cleveland district of Yorkshire where the writer is working.

people. We are to leave those parishes where, by reason of the number of the inhabitants and the nature of their occupations, the pastoral work of a priest is specially difficult, to tend flocks which are not too large to be known, and to minister to those whose occupation may predispose them to receive our message.

The priest who comes to a Cleveland village with these hopes will not be altogether disappointed. He will be very unfortunate if he does not find a small body of believers, happy in their worship in the parish church, happy in their enjoyment of the Sacraments, and ready to hear the Word of God and to practise it. They are, or they may become, the salt of village society; and his first care will be for them. The rest of his people, for the most part, are sincere in following such light as they have, but are not anxious to expose themselves to more; they think more of the good life than of worship, and their use of the means of grace is cautious and spasmodic. Beyond these, and travelling in orbits still farther removed from the centre of Christian light and heat, are the minority of country folk, baptized as members of the Church of England, who, after they come of age, do not desire the Word and Sacraments, and are content to follow such ways of Christian living as they may have learnt at school or may glean from intercourse with their neighbours. The wise parson will not disregard these two sources of instruction; for each of his parishioners is in some measure formed and influenced by them; and men and women may often be persuaded to lead Christian lives without consciously holding Christian beliefs, provided that education and society be arranged to that end.

In what measure are the education and the customs of rural society conducive to the Christian life? A national system of education reflects the character of the national society; it has become the first phase of the influence of society to which the citizen is subjected throughout his life. To ask what is the aim of our present system, as regards the formation of character, is to ask what type of character our present society is intended to produce. To what end is it arranged? These are puzzling questions; especially if, as may be the case, education and society are directed by no conscious aims, and subjected to no ruling purpose. It is likely that the want of purpose in our present system of education has led to the formation of surprising and undesirable types of character. In country districts this

want of purpose in the formation of character is often corrected by the tradition of the local schools. Many of them are Church schools, in which the teachers are themselves believers, and in which some part of the religious instruction is still given by the parson. Where children go out of the village to school, they appear to have less opportunity of acquiring Christian habits of thought and practice.

Does the common life of the countryside, as it is at present arranged, permit a Christian way of life for those who are believers, and encourage it for those who do not consciously order their lives by Christian principles? Or is it a hindrance to everyone, making the road hard for those who believe, and tending to degrade those who unthinkingly accept it? The form of the common life owes a good deal to the nature of the common work; and it may be observed that the pursuits of agriculture are more favourable to the development of a Christian way of life than those associated with mechanized industry. The daily contact with nature encourages in the farmer a sense of dependence upon natural forces which does not naturally arise in the factory or in the office, and which is wholly favourable to religion. The character of work on the land requires the frequent exercise of free and responsible judgment, thus developing those capacities of our human nature which, though valuable in Christian estimation, are not generally required in the service of the machine. The small farm, which is still the normal agricultural unit, provides for the man who owns and works it an opportunity of personal expression in the use of his own property. If, as often happens, the farm is worked by the farmer and his family, this common interest and employment provides a bond of union and opportunities of constant intercourse which deepen and strengthen the family life, and which are not available in the family of a man on shift work, for example, or of the clerk in his office. Agriculture has also the negative but entirely salutary effect of setting limits to the consequences of avarice. In those who are bound to the soil, avarice may be at least as strong, and as individually pernicious, as in some who acquire wealth through mechanized industries; but the shadow of the farmer's avarice cannot extend over the lives of thousands of human beings, living in widely separated spots and distributed over the surface of the globe; it is limited to his farm and his family and his immediate neighbours. It

needs machines and transport to give avarice wings. The farmer may also have a sense of vocation which arises from the nature of his work. In growing food for man and beast, he may believe that his work is in line with God's purpose; how many factory hands can think that? And how can a man's life be wholly given to the service of God if he cannot think that? There are now appearing certain methods of farming, and forms of Government control, which work against the more benevolent tendencies of agriculture; but it may still be said that work on the land is at least as conducive to the Christian life as any other calling or occupation.

The supremacy of personal relationships in rural society also works in this direction. In the fellowship of the village community—a fellowship which is almost wholly absent from those associations of individuals which, in any of our large towns, share a common abode without a common purpose—those relationships which are personal take precedence over those which are economic or legal. The ideal of the good neighbour is deeply rooted both in the thought and in the practice of the farming community. If a farmer hurts himself or falls ill, his neighbours will never see him fast, no matter what sacrifice of time and labour is required of them. The relationships between the farmer and his men are of the same personal character; the men generally live as members of the family, sharing the same house and the same table. The very considerable difference in wealth between those who work together in the same fields creates no corresponding difference of social standing. The farmer's man does not generally trouble to claim payment for overtime; he is sometimes so happy in his place and work that he is content, by free agreement, to receive less than the minimum wage. On the whole, though economic considerations play a large part in rural life, it is a subordinate part; personal relationships are supreme.

This supremacy may, however, be threatened from another quarter. It would appear that modern societies which have accepted the supremacy of economics afterwards fall an easy prey to bureaucratic tyranny, and so stumble from unlimited freedom to unlimited control. The society of the countryside, though it has never itself altogether accepted the supremacy of economics, has suffered from the acceptance of that supremacy by the nation as a whole; and it is not likely to escape the mischiefs of the national

remedy for the national mistake. The farmer is now subject to considerable control, through the various marketing boards and county committees. But his woes are as nothing compared with those of rural tradesmen, who, harassed by intricate and ever-changing legislation, find it hard to go straight. The multiplication of these impersonal forms of relationship menaces the Christian life; for the Christian ethic has been developed to apply to relationships which are personal, so that in impersonal matters a Christian is apt to find himself without guidance; certainly the Christian virtues flower best in a society whose members encounter each other in personal intercourse.

The parson, therefore, as he surveys this rural scene will distinguish his tasks. First, he will apply himself to serve and guide those who want him and who are ready to use his ministrations. He will also consider what modifications are desirable in rural society, what should grow and what should wither, so that it may best serve to encourage Christian behaviour.

II

The fortunes of the Church in the country turn very largely upon the character of the country parson. For the outlook of the countryman does not extend very far beyond the boundaries of his own parish; he does not consider the work of the Church as a whole, and it is difficult for him to regard himself as a member of a world-wide society. For him the Church means the Church in his parish; and the personal embodiment of it which most concerns him is the parson.

The country parson must love his flock; otherwise he will not love his work. His people may have much to teach him in their love for their stock, for the favourite mare, the good milker, or the pet lamb. The good farmer is not only concerned with profits and with prices, though of course he does not disregard them; he has an affection for the animals he tends and which help him in his work. They must not be hungered, exposed to cold, over-worked, or neglected. He has a similar love for the land he tills, and a pride in working it. "Work on the land is lovely work" was the ungrudging verdict of a farm labourer after a life of ceaseless toil; and many farmers will enjoy the epitaph which appears on a Gloucestershire tombstone:

Here lieth John Higgs,
A famous man for killing pigs.
For killing pigs was his delight,
Morning, afternoon, and night.

Now people who themselves feel this love for their beasts and for their fields will soon know whether the parson loves his flock. He will find that all his people want him to visit them, whether they come to church or not; and no criticism of the parson weighs more with the countryman than the charge that he doesn't visit. For, to the farmer and his wife, not to visit means not to love. A farmer generally goes round his sheep every day to see that they are all right: not fast in the hedge, not drowned in the beck, not lamed in the ditches; to care for his sheep at all means at least to visit them, and he will be quick to apply to the parson the logic which he has learned in the fields.

The country parson, if he be meant for his work, will find his flock lovable in themselves and in their ways. He appreciates their quiet family virtue, their integrity, their respect for the good neighbour, and their pride in their resources. There is a pride in the farmer as he shows you his sleek cows, his good-humoured, contented pigs, his young bull-calf, or his growing corn. There is a pride in the farmer's wife as she displays her skill on baking day, when you sit in her kitchen and watch with amazement as she manipulates the blazing logs and withdraws from the oven the incredible tarts. If the parson does not appreciate these things, why is he in the country?

If he loves his people he will be diligent in his prayers, especially in the daily recitation of mattins and evensong. For though he must normally recite these offices alone, he recites them on behalf of his people. On their behalf the praises rise; for them, as for himself, the petitions are made for common blessings which touch them all. He will take care that not only on Sunday does he give of his best to his people when he leads them in worship, but that as far as in him lies no day shall pass without worship in his parish, and if possible in his parish church. For he believes that he has no right to expect the grace of God to descend upon that place and upon those people if he neglects his duty of intercession.

He will also be diligent in his study of the Scriptures; and here he has the advantage that his knowledge of rural work will increase his interest in them and help him to understand

them. The revelation of God in the Bible is given in the setting of an agricultural and pastoral society; and in the country a man can gain a knowledge of sheep, corn, and trees, which will serve him well in his study of the Bible, and which will help him to secure the interest of his people in the stories and parables which show the dealings of God, in real life, with shepherds and farmers and gardeners like themselves. This study of the Scriptures will be the first call upon his time, after his duties of worship, and it will find its principal expression in his sermons. The depth and range of his further studies will depend upon his previous training and upon his domestic situation. As a general rule, the country parsonage can no longer be a home of learning; servants are neither cheap nor plentiful, and even gardeners are hard to come by. The parson will find that much of the leisure time with which he is generally credited is occupied by the necessary duties of house and garden. Scholarship and writing require a domestic situation very different from that which is now normally found in the rural vicarage.

The country parson will not be unduly elated or depressed by the number of his communicants or of his congregations. The work which he does cannot be measured by statistics. The standards by which he works are those of duty rather than success. He did not promise at his ordination either to fill his church or to make his parochial returns impressive. But he did promise to be diligent in his prayers and in his study of the Scriptures, to be faithful in his ministry of Word and Sacrament, and to teach his people how they should live, not only by his words, but by the example of himself and of his household. His work is always the work of spring, when there is less thought of the harvest than of the proper sowing.

III

There are old people in most of our country parishes who remember the days when the church was full; to them it seems but a shadow of its former self. What has happened?

First, the depopulation of the countryside. The national pursuit of riches swiftly acquired by industry required a plentiful supply of cheap labour; and if starvation was to be avoided, cheap labour could not be had without cheap food. We therefore opened our ports and markets to the surplus produce of other nations, who could well afford to

sell what they did not want at a price far below that at which the British farmer could produce it. This policy brought about the ruin of agriculture; and, in course of time, the countryside assumed the derelict appearance—untrimmed hedges, soggy fields, buildings inconvenient and needing repairs—with which we are familiar. The farm workers, together with such skilled people as weavers, blacksmiths, shoemakers, carpenters, and those engaged in other country occupations, unable to find work in the country, moved to the town, and helped to create the problem of unemployment. For those who remained on the land there were low wages, long hours, hard labour, and bank overdrafts. The ruin of the farmer has been accompanied by the steady ruin of the squires, the victims of death duties which, falling hard upon the owners of large estates, take little account of the social consequences of taxation in rural areas. Now these plain causes for the decline of the Church, because they need a long memory, are often forgotten. Our churches are no longer full, partly because there are not the people to fill them; partly because on the whole we no longer receive the weighty support of a rich and influential landed gentry. These are not the only causes of our troubles, but they are of great historical importance.

The Church of England has been adversely affected by the impoverishment of the squires. The supply of parsons, who as the sons of country gentlemen had a sound knowledge of the countryside and a deep interest in its welfare, has been stopped at the source, and we have now to grapple with the problem of training suitable lads from among the farming community to be country parsons. But perhaps even more disastrous than the loss of suitable country parsons is the eclipse of that section of the rural laity which by their education were best fitted to understand the Church of England, and, by their influence, best able to support her.

The restoration of agriculture to its proper place in the life of the nation is a plain matter of social justice and national welfare. The present depopulation of the countryside can only be remedied by legislation which secures for the farmer a just price for his product, and for the labourer a fair reward for his toil. The welfare of agriculture turns upon the fixed price and the fixed minimum wage; and apart from all disputes as to what this price or this wage ought to be, it is the duty and interest of the Church to urge that these

principles, now adopted by the Government in the hazards of war, should remain in force in the calm days of peace. The conditions of labour on the farms, at least in this district, are severe. The labourer must work six full days a week, and is normally expected to work at least part of Sunday. Holidays are exceptional; it is rare to hear of the farmer or his man taking a week's holiday; men and women who in spring work until dark, at haytime until midnight, in autumn until dark, and in winter until milking time at seven or later in the evening, have little experience of leisure. Early rising, long hours, a drink, a game of cards, or dancing in the winter, a pipe by the fire, or a glance at the newspaper when the day's work is done, are the lot of the farmer and his man. His wife is, for the most part, never done; it is not uncommon even in winter to visit our farm-houses and to find the women still working at nine at night or even later; at hay-time and harvest they are out in the fields till late, and in the autumn the house-work must often be done after a hard spell of potato-picking. Nor are these conditions due solely to the war; they are the normal lot of our people in times of peace. Like the plough horse which plods patiently down the furrow, they continue, and bear them. But is it right that they should be required to do so? How does this state of affairs look when measured by the requirements of the fifth point in the Archbishop of Canterbury's book on Christianity and social order?

> Every citizen should have sufficient daily leisure, with two days of rest in seven, and, if an employee, an annual holiday with pay, to enable him to enjoy a full personal life with such interests and activities as his tasks and talents may direct.

The state of our rural education is almost as depressing as that of agriculture. Apart from the skill and knowledge which touch their work, and the moral traditions with which generations of Christian teaching have supplied them, the minds of our country population are wrapped in deep and almost impenetrable darkness. Art, music, literature, history, are to them unknown regions, in which their feeble and forced explorations cease at the age of fourteen, never to be resumed. There appears to be a tendency for men and women who work with animals to become like them, not only in their wonderful patience and common sense, but also in their depressing lack of mental vigour, and in their

disposition to tolerate any surroundings provided that they be free from draughts.

Our Church schools still bear witness to the fact that Christian people first shouldered the responsibility of public education, which has now to a large extent been taken over by the State. It is something to have roused up Leviathan, but he needs to be stimulated to further exertions. The second point in the Archbishop's book runs:

> Every child should have the opportunity of an education till years of maturity, so planned as to allow for his peculiar aptitudes and make possible their full development. This education should throughout be inspired by faith in God and find its focus in worship.

Does the first part of this requirement sound romantic when we think of our country schools? It will hardly be thought that a boy or girl reaches maturity younger than eighteen; and it is manifest that if the education of our country youth is to continue until that age, the type of education provided, at least in the later stages, must be vastly different from anything we have now. The present system aims too little at the training of character, and it does not provide for a period of apprenticeship and oversight during the years of adolescence, in which a lad could learn his work without being bound to earn his living, or being free to do pretty much what he liked with his wages. It is not good that the country lad after fourteen should be so free from control: able to smoke excessively, to stay late at dances to which he will walk miles in the most appalling weather, to sit lightly to all religious duties, and to come to manhood devoid of almost all sense of public responsibility. It is not good that the country girl should so early accept the heavy work of the house or the farm, and should never, in later years, receive such training in the care of a home and of a family as should enable her to free herself from the fetters of country ways, in some respects ignorant and intolerable.

The education of the future must provide for the adult as well as for the child. Our children, in their tender years, are now submitted to a process of forced feeding which would come much better when the birds were older, so to speak, and had had some experience. There was in Denmark, before the German occupation, a well-developed movement for the education of the rural population. The People's High Schools were residential colleges, situated in pleasant surroundings, which offered to farmers and farm-workers,

at a moderate cost, short courses of study during the winter months when work on the farms was most slack. They were not technical colleges, providing training in agriculture, but universities on a small scale, offering courses in literature, history, and in kindred subjects which require some experience of life for their full appreciation. It was the belief of one of the founders of this movement that men could be noble in soul, even if their work was to milk cows and clear away the dung. There is no doubt that the People's High Schools have opened the minds and developed the character of the Danish peasantry, and have brought to them that quickening of spirit which, among other things, made them want to be better farmers, and gave them the will to make their agricultural methods the admiration of the world. The attempts now being made in this country in adult education have not gone very far in rural areas. The Women's Institutes have done something by providing lectures on the keeping of hens, the making of slippers, household cookery, and so forth. These are good as far as they go, but they are technical, rather spasmodic, and confined to the women. The Local Education Authority has fostered Evening Institutes; but these, like all other experiments in rural education, are hampered by poor travelling facilities, the want of suitable staff, the lack of proper accommodation, and above all by the lack of leisure experienced by those who might benefit by them. A man or woman who after a hard day's work has walked by lanes deep in mud and snow to a dingy schoolroom is not the most suitable subject for higher education, even if a competent instructor could be provided. The British Drama League and the Rural Community Councils are also interested in the matter; the latter, especially, in the provision of suitable village halls.

The relation of the Church towards these and similar bodies which have assumed responsibility for the common life of the countryside is indeed a delicate matter which confronts every country parson. It is often said in our villages that the clergy dislike the Women's Institutes. We may hope that the report is mistaken; for without giving unqualified approval to all the ladies do, it is evident that the general aim of these Institutes is good, and that they offer to their members a measure of fellowship and education which at present cannot otherwise be had. They also tend to strengthen the family life of the home and the social life

of the village community. It serves no good purpose to look askance at this and similar societies because they are non-denominational. For this is largely our fault; the divisions of the Church are so deep in our villages that those movements which seek fellowship in the pursuit of certain common human interests cannot achieve their aim unless they remain officially unconnected to any religious body. This does not mean that such movements are non-religious; it is probable that their aims cannot be achieved at all without drawing upon reserves of religious thought and feeling in each of their members. Here, as in the case of education, our ecclesiastical divisions have gone far to prevent those who attempt some good work for the people from drawing upon those spiritual resources without which they cannot wholly succeed in their task. How are we to make the Church a well of living water for those societies which do not come thither to draw? Partly through the influence of individual Christians, and the measure of this influence will largely depend upon the pastoral work of the parson; partly through the whole-hearted co-operation with which the parson and possibly the parochial church council may support the work of secular movements which aim at the welfare of the countryside.

The problems of the relation of the Church to the common life of the countryside are of the same character as those which beset the relation of the Church to the common life of the nation. It appears that in the fashioning of the modern world the Church can no longer take the lead, even if she so desired; but ought she to abdicate from all social responsibility until compelled to do so? Can she still serve the society in which her lot is cast by developing in her members a social conscience formed on Christian principles, and by encouraging them to co-operate as fellow workers in those movements which pursue human and secular aims, good in their place, and which make for the establishment of human welfare? What are the place and duty of the people of God in a totalitarian society?

A. C. Scupholme.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. H. Cunliffe-Jones is Professor of Systematic Theology at the Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford.

The Rev. Glyn Simon is Warden of St Michael's College, Llandaff. He was Warden of Ordinands in Bangor and St Asaph dioceses from 1931 to 1940.

The Rev. A. C. Scupholme is Vicar of Ugthorpe, near Whitby.

The Rev. W. W. S. March is serving as a Chaplain to the Forces.

The Rev. H. G. Emmet is Assistant Curate of St Peter's Church, Leicester.

NOTES

The Rev. B. H. P. Fisher, of 17, The Abbey, Romsey, writes with reference to the article on "The Two Swords" which appeared in May (p. 296):

"Dr Wright is quite correct in his interpretation of the words ἱκανόν ἐστιν in St Luke xxii, 38: it is simply 'Enough!' corresponding exactly to the Hindustani use of 'bas,' just dismissing the question, and obviously translating the same word as St Mark's ἀπέχει in xiv, 41; a passage which is oddly mistranslated in the English. καθεύδετε λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε does not mean 'Sleep on now,' but 'Sleep later,' when you will have time for it: *cp.* 2 Tim. iv, 8."

The Editor thanks several other correspondents for letters which, owing to considerations of space, he is not able to publish.

REVISED REVIEWS—XVII

Mansel's Bampton Lectures, 1858.

I

When Dean Burgon of Chichester included Henry Longueville Mansel as "the Christian Philosopher" among his *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, he was well aware that his opinion could not rest unchallenged. Mansel's theological reputation had been made thirty years previously by the Bampton Lectures of 1858, and from the first they stirred keen controversy.

In these lectures Mansel writes under the direct influence of Sir William Hamilton's *Philosophy of the Unconditioned.* Against this background he seeks to demonstrate that " the limits of religious thought are but a manifestation of the limits of thought in general " (Lecture I). He illustrates his theme by an examination of " three terms, familiar as household words in the vocabulary of Philosophy," First Cause, Absolute, Infinite (Lecture II), exposes what he considers to be " the inadequacy of these ideas " as due to their contradiction or " mode in which they are viewed by the mind," and concludes that " the apparent contradiction . . . proves that there are limits to man's power of thought: and it proves no more " (Lecture III). This " admission that the whole consciousness of man " (and " the religious consciousness in particular ") " is limited in the manner of its operation and in the objects to which it is related " forms " the whole basis " of his discussion (Lecture IV) and leads to the famous distinction between speculative and regulative truth:

> There are two modes in which we may endeavour to contemplate the Deity: the one negative, based on a vain attempt to transcend the conditions of human thought, . . . aimed at a *speculative* knowledge of God as He is, . . . obtains nothing but a tissue of ambitious contradictions, which only indicate what He is not . . .: the other positive, which keeps within its proper limits, and views the object in a manner accommodated to the finite capacities of the human thinker, . . . is content with those *regulative* ideas of the Deity which are sufficient to guide our practice, but not to satisfy our intellect—which tell us, not what God is in Himself, but how He wills that we should think of Him (Lectures IV-V).

The final three Lectures are devoted to an application of this basic distinction to the spheres of Theology, Philosophy, and Morality.

The key-phrases which we have quoted make clear that in developing his argument Mansel numbered himself among " the defenders of Christianity." He firmly believed Christianity and indeed all religion to be outside the scope of human criticism and invulnerable to the attacks of reason: " the primary and proper object of criticism is not Religion, natural or revealed, but the human mind in its relation to Religion." From this axiom, carefully italicized in the text, he proceeded to mark the bounds within which the human mind may roam. His mood throughout is of such intense reverence and deep devotion that he warns his hearers " how often, in modern literature, both at home and abroad, the most sacred names are played with, in familiar, almost contemptuous intimacy," and offers an apology for himself talking philosophy in the pulpit. More than one of his fine periods must have sounded very like prayers when they were first said. Yet an unfriendly critic was quick to remark upon " the happy inconsistency which appears between his philosophy and his personal convictions."

II

The Times newspaper of January 11, 1859, signalled controversy. If Mr Mansel's principles be adopted, the anonymous writer declared, " the finite becomes the only school in which we can study the Infinite, and the distinct appreciation of the temporal is the best proximate measure of the Eternal. All mystic Theology disappears before this doctrine at once. The followers of Thomas à Kempis, in all their degrees, the whole list of religious men who have endeavoured to abstract themselves from sense and its conditions, are proved the merest triflers." That was typical of the heat of the moment, and of the strenuous pamphlet-debate which followed. Attacks came from two main directions. On the one hand, the Rev. F. D. Maurice addressed to the lecturer his 480 pages of " strictures " on the ground that the notion of Christian revelation was in jeopardy. On the other hand, Professor Goldwin Smith roundly declared that " in the supposed interest of revealed religion " morality had been undermined and truth denied. The double conflict produced a considerable bulk of literature which, with its chain of objections, replies, counter-objections, counter-replies, bewilders the present-day reader. Nevertheless a student of the Lectures cannot well afford to ignore these commentaries. Without doubt Mansel had alarmed his Christian contemporaries. Did not Spencer admit in the " prospectus " of his philosophical writings, issued in March 1860, that he was in effect " carrying a step further the doctrines put into shape by Hamilton and Mansel "? The fact that such an assertion could be made was sufficient cause of consternation. But controversy was to draw from Mansel explanations which suggested that his aim was to modernize orthodoxy rather than to provide an unorthodox modernism.

The Mansel-Maurice episode was keen. The two had been in conflict earlier. Hort had been urging Maurice to speak his mind in February 1854, and Maurice knew that he felt the issue too keenly not to run the risk of giving offence. " I am sorry if I have done anything which seemed rude to Mr Mansel," he wrote in a frank letter in 1857. " Nothing was further from my intention. . . . The subject of my difference with those who think that revelation does not reveal is now the uppermost in my mind." His reply to the Bamptons appeared in 1859 with the title, *What is Revelation?* His Gospel was at stake, and this was no private matter: it was the concern of " the humblest believer in every cottage, on every hospital pallet." Let the theologian match the philosopher with his own autonomy: " Here, it seems to me, is the office of the theologian. . . . So far as he is asserting, he is a dogmatist. But he does not rest his assertion upon his own judgment or upon the judgment of he ages; he addresses it to the conscience, heart, reason of

mankind. He leaves God to justify it in His own way, by the sorrows, needs, contradictions of men. He desires only that the news should go forth with no force but its own. He can trust it; for he can trust Him who has shown us in His Son what He is." This is not unlike language which we hear in certain anti-rational circles to-day.

Goldwin Smith diverted attention from theology to ethics. In a note appended to his lectures on *The Study of History* he maintained that Mansel's theory broke the continuity between divine and human morality and consequently negatived one or the other. Mansel retorted in a new rôle. He now plays the traditionalist, appealing to Anglican precedent. In certain respects his change in attitude may have been occasioned by the change of opponents. In 1861 the Professor was writing in the correspondence columns of the *Daily News* (December 3) that the formularies of the Church of England were "a mass of heterogeneous Tudor dogmas," and before long he was to uncover his real convictions by leaving for America and agnosticism. But it is not impossible to detect in Mansel a shift of emphasis, which significantly follows the controversy with Maurice. By 1862 he had sufficiently clarified his thought to make this remarkable disclosure in his *Second Letter* to Goldwin Smith:

> The Schoolmen have said that we know the divine attributes *analogice* and *per creaturas*. . . . I have endeavoured to express the same thing by the term *regulative truth*, a term which, though suggested by the language of Kant, is used . . . in a different manner.

This is illuminating. It helps to explain certain important footnotes to his original Lectures, which an unwary reader might pass unnoticed (Lecture IV, Note 24: on regulative truth; Lecture VIII, Notes 20, 21, 22: on analogy). It suggests that whatever be the results of what he said in the Lectures, his intention was to keep well within the traditional structure of Christian theology. Both his prominence in his own day and his obscurity now show that in this attempt to rewrite tradition in contemporary terms he failed. It is indicative of this that his main opponents followed *The Times*, and attacked not the contents but the consequences of his doctrine.

III

The book makes timely reading for to-day. In the context of the controversies which it excited, it is a useful warning against exaggerated eagerness to restate our Faith in the "modern thought" of any moment and the opposite literalism of exclusive concentration on New Testament language. The serene manner, sustained throughout, is a welcome change after the agitated and, at times, artificial cleverness of much recent

writing, and the Notes at the end of the volume should be read alongside quotations and outstanding paragraphs in the text (particularly the " blue vault of heaven " and " know thyself " passages). This is an excellent anthology of Christian prose.

W. W. S. March.

THE THEOLOGICAL PROBLEM IN MR EMLYN WILLIAMS

Emlyn Williams is now well known. He is known as a film star, as an actor and playwright, and as a post-scripter of the B.B.C. When such a well-known person writes two plays, both of which have had such marked success as *The Light of Heart* and *The Morning Star*, then it is time that someone took notice, not only to urge the public to enjoy such a drama but also seriously to look at the plays to see what the author is trying to express.

Maddoc—a fine actor and a drunkard, who gives way to that temptation every time things do not go entirely to plan; a fine man who goes wrong. This is no new theme, but in *The Light of Heart* this theme is given a significant twist which expresses a new spirit among the more serious of our playwrights and novelists. This is what Maddoc says of himself:

> Don't think too badly of me because I haven't come to anything in the end. You see, love, I was never meant to. I've got things in me, I know that, but the trouble is *I'm* one of those freak machines with every good part running against a wonky one, and in the end nothing moves at all. In the middle of that dress rehearsal—when I suddenly knew that I had got to those heights Irving told me about—I had an odd feeling of standing at the back of the circle—as I am now, rather dirty, down at heel—watching myself on the stage and saying: " By Jove, he's a great personality, that old boy ! He's a success !" There I was on the stage, showing this old shadowy tramp what was what. And, of course, it was the other way about—the old tramp at the back of the circle was the real me—because here I am, flesh and blood—whereas King Lear, nobody'll ever see him. . . . See ? Funny.

Maddoc is not a man who goes wrong, but is a man who is wrong, and who can only be kept going by his daughter Cattrin, who, as it were, " pumps life into him " and keeps him up to scratch. Maddoc obviously has the vocation to be a fine actor, but he is unable to be this because of the one " wonky wheel " which always hinders the true working of his machine. But this is not all. Cattrin, his daughter, is the only person who does pump life into him, and at first sight she is the very person who has the power to do so. It would seem that such is her vocation, for nature has, or very early circumstances have, given

her a crippled foot. The description that Mr Williams has given of her in the stage directions is a good one:

> She is 28, but looks younger, in spite of an ungainly appearance caused by one (pronouncedly) crippled foot, in a boot, which she manages with cheerful address. Her hair is done simply, but her face is hardly made-up; her effect of being pretty seems to come mostly from the frank pleasantness of her manner. In moments of stillness and contemplation she is beautiful. During the next moments, out of breath and excited, she is like an awkward puppy stumping round the room. . . .

She is all that; she has this crippled foot, but she also has the natural instincts that a woman has—the desire for a husband, a home, children. Why? Who would want to marry such an ungainly creature? But she is like this. The miracle happens; Robert falls in love with her and another vicious circle is set up. He too has his weaknesses, and if Cattrin has to care for her father, then he, too, will be unable to be the fullest person that he is capable of being. The point is in the word "is"; in all these persons there is going on a conflict that belongs to their very natures. That is the real problem. They discover that they are all one of these "freak machines with every good part running against a wonky one," and here lies the tragedy of it all. This is a very serious problem, and a theological and a Christian one too. Maddoc commits suicide and thus releases Cattrin to marry Robert. But what an answer to the problem! Maddoc did well at the dress rehearsal of "King Lear," but the shock of hearing that Cattrin wanted to marry Robert was too much for him and off he went "on the booze." But he never played that first night.

> *Cattrin:* There's a crowd running up—thousands of them—and he was worth all of them together. . . . In one second they'll be pouring up those stairs—through that door. . . .
> *Robert:* And while we've got this second, we've got to say one thing, and make ourselves believe it. He played that first night after all.
> *Cattrin:* But he didn't—he didn't.
> *Robert:* We've got to make ourselves believe that he did and made the success of his life.
> *Cattrin:* They all thought he was finished, but now——
> *Robert:* He's all right.
> *Cattrin:* He's all right.

So *The Light of Heart* ends, but the problem does not. If in *The Light of Heart* Mr Williams presents us with a "wonky" machine, in *The Morning Star* he presents us with a whole factory which has gone wrong, or, rather, which "is" wrong. In *The Light of Heart* we dealt with individuals; in *The Morning Star* we are dealing with society. In one of the most brilliant passages of the play, written as only Mr Williams can write, Cliff, a young and clever doctor, gives a description of what it feels like to dig bodies out of a hospital which has been "blitzed":

" Pathology Lab, deep X-ray plant, new west-wing theatre. Smashed, smashed, smashed " (those three words are the most brilliant-spoken words of the whole play). " It was like the end of the world. . . . And yet there we were, shouting, larking, lugging people out, digging, bandaging, finding the bandaging was a waste of time—then on to something else, quick, don't think. . . . I put my hand into a dark corner and touched a man's head: the line of scalp along the parting felt warm to the touch, beautifully warm; somebody's alive, thank God . . . it was the only incurable case I had. . . . Don't think—quick, on to something else, don't think. . . ." And so it goes on until at last he leaves the hospital and begins to go home. " And I started thinking, quite unashamed, about God . . . and I thought, there *is* something, very high up, very far away, high up over the balloon barrage, high up over the jerry planes, watching us, hard, and saying: ' Stop asking why it all has to be, you'll know in my own time; the only thing that interests me is, are you going to lie down, or are you going to stick together and fight ?' "

What a " public " question this is, and one showing a keen insight into the mind of the community, for it is a public opinion. Here we are confronted with a world that is wrong, and yet with the conviction that a God exists who is a God of Love and a God of Mercy and a God of Justice. But if Mr Williams asks this very relevant question he fails to give a satisfactory answer. Cliff's wife returns from her bus-conductoring and from a visit to the doctor with the news that she is going to present him with a baby. But at what a time ! Is it good news or bad news ? Cliff's mother answers the question:

> Because it's a time like this, it's the best news I've ever heard. . . .
> It's going on, isn't it . . the world's going on? Children coming up, millions of 'em, running and shouting; we're going to stick together, so they'll have a chance ?

But what Mr Williams fails to tell us is what the chance is for. For what purpose are we to stick together ? And what is the " chance " that we hope to hand on to the generation that comes after us ?

From the point of view of " commercial theatre " *The Morning Star* is probably the better of the two plays, dealing, as it does, with the London " blitz "; with the strivings of Cliff to better the world and to relieve suffering with his researches. But on the other hand Mr Williams, in my opinion, fails to think right through his theme. Perhaps it is that he gives in to the glitter and glamour of the West End theatre ?

In a short review of this nature I have dealt only with one theme that seems common to the two plays. I have said nothing of Mr Williams' character studies, for that is not my business and belongs to what the Archbishop of Canterbury describes as

" the autonomy of technique." But rather I have tried to draw attention to the more serious theme which seems to concern us as Christians in our desire to know what it is that one of the more popular of our modern playwrights is thinking—and to draw out that theme of the plays. I leave the more technical criticism to those more competent than I.

H. G. Emmet.

COMMONWEALTH ORDINATIONS

At the suggestion of both the Editor and of Dr Day I am allowed to add a note to the valuable and interesting article which appeared in June. The subject of ordinations under the Commonwealth and Protectorate has never before been very thoroughly explored, chiefly, I suppose, because the printed authorities are few and at best skimpy. The material for the fuller story is in MS., in the Exhibits Books made by diocesan Registrars at episcopal Visitations in the years following the Restoration. When a bishop " visited " his diocese for the first time " every parson, vicar, curate, schoolmaster and other person licensed whosoever " (this included surgeons, parish clerks and midwives) were to exhibit their Letters of Orders, Licences, etc., to be signed, if approved, by the Registrar, who charged a fee for his trouble and noted the particulars in a book, a *Liber Exhibitorum*. These books were not diocesan archives; they were the property of the Registrar. Consequently when he died or resigned they presumably went with his private papers. Certainly they are very rarely to be met with, but among the fine collection of archives in the diocesan registry at York several such books have been preserved, and by the kindness of the late Registrar there, that good antiquary the late Mr A. V. Hudson, I was allowed to make a transcript of two of them, containing the exhibits at Visitations by Archbishop Sterne in 1667 and in 1674, and notes of a Visitation of the diocese of Chester by the same archbishop as metropolitan in 1669.

Episcopal Registers reveal no facts about ordinations between 1642 and 1660, so far as I can discover. After all, the Registrars went when the dioceses were dissolved and the old machinery collapsed. It is true that Bishop Duppa of Salisbury kept a private record of those whom he ordained and gave them formal Letters of Orders after the Restoration, but he seems the only bishop to have done so. Bishop Skinner has left no record in the Oxford Registry, and the Register of Bishop Henry King is missing at Chichester. The Commonwealth ordinations of English diocesan bishops are known through the printed biographies of men ordained by them whose names Dr Day has collected, though to them should be added John Dolben, later Archbishop of York, ordained in 1656 by

Bishop Henry King. In passing I may say that I doubt whether Bishop Juxon ordained at all during the period: he was very inaccessible compared with Skinner at Launton, or Brownrig and King, both in the Thames valley. But the remarkable fact revealed by the Exhibits Books is the number of ordinations by Irish and Scots bishops who had taken refuge in England. Chief among them was Thomas Fuller (cousin of the historian), Bishop of Ardfert and Aghadoe, 1641-1661, and then Archbishop of Cashel till his death in 1667. Another was Henry Tilson, friend of Strafford, and like him a Yorkshireman, Bishop of Elphin from 1639 till he died in 1655. Robert Maxwell, Bishop of Kilmore from 1643 and after 1660 of Ardagh also, till he died in 1672, ordained seven times between 1647 and 1652. Out of forty men ordained by Bishop Fuller, twenty-nine were ordained between 1647 and 1649; and of twenty-one ordained by Bishop Tilson, twenty were ordained between 1647 and 1655. Bishop Sydserf was in France during much of the period, so was Bishop (later Archbishop) Bramhall, both of whom ordained pretty frequently just as the period was ending. Out of the 514 men whose Orders I have noted, 125 were ordained by one or other of those five bishops. I am sure that in these and most other cases these men received their Letters of Orders at the time, for one of the bishops was dead before the Restoration, as indeed was Bishop Brownrig. Of the Letters of Orders so given there is a copy of those for Deacon and Priest given to Samuel Mathewes, B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, ordained to both Orders on February 12, 1656, by the Bishop of Ardfert. Mr Mathewes became curate of Clunbury, Herefordshire, in that year and after the Restoration formally registered his Orders in the Register of Bishop Monk, 1661. I may add that there is some account of Bishop Skinner's secret ordinations at Launton in the *Life*, by Thomas Warton, of the famous President of Trinity College, Oxford, Dr Ralph Bathurst (London, 1761, pp. 36-38).

The most valuable point of all in Dr Day's article seems to me his discovery of the motives which led a man like Patrick, who had received Presbyterian ordination, to seek Holy Orders from a bishop. I had come to believe that such a step was due in most of such cases to the influence of theologians like Hammond: now, by discovering the passage in Patrick's *Life*, Dr Day has gone far to solving the puzzle. That it was not a shrewd anticipation of a coming Restoration is abundantly clear from the dates of the ordinations which I have noted. At present I am trying to discover how many of these men ordained during the Commonwealth had previously been ordained in a Presbyterian *classis*—not a very easy task, as all too few records of such " classes " remain. When I have finished that study I hope to print the results of my inquiries, upon which I have been engaged, with many interruptions, for the last ten years.

The learned Dr St John Seymour, Archdeacon of Cashel and Emley, informs me that no help can be got from the Irish episcopal Registers of the period, since what Registers survived were kept in the Public Records Office in Dublin and were burnt when the Four Courts were burnt in 1922. I have tried various Registries in England without success for records of ordinations, and I have sought Exhibits Books up and down England in vain, though some Registries I have not yet tried. I have found no Church historian who has ever seen, let alone used, such books. I hope that Dr Day's article may lead other students to search the diocesan Registries for Exhibits Books more thoroughly than I have done.

S. L. Ollard.

Windsor.

NOTE ON A "RELIGION AND LIFE" CAMPAIGN

Mr Vernon Bartlett is a very distinguished speaker with a vast knowledge of foreign affairs, and he is always interesting, but these considerations alone hardly justify his inclusion among the speakers on the "Religion and Life" platform. He began by saying that he never went to church. He had not time. That was unfortunate, for the importance of finding time for worship even when busy had not in any case been overstressed in these meetings. He went on to say, which was worse, that if we wanted our churches filled we simply must take an interest in politics. Mr Bartlett's address, with its wrong emphasis, was, however, more stimulating than others in which there was nothing to criticize. He made one ask just what the "Religion and Life" Campaign was really aiming at. There are two things that very much need doing but which cannot perhaps be done at the same time from the same platform. Did we fall between two stools? One is to convey a challenge to those who already profess Christianity in some form: to get together and try to see the world with its burden of sin, to which we all contribute, through our Lord's eyes, and to discover, so far as may be, what such insights mean to us in terms of sacrifice and service. It is too true that our piety is liable to stop where our interests begin. The other is to present Christianity to those who do not profess to be Christians, and for this it is doubtful whether "practical" Christianity is the right approach. People can only begin to take a Christian view of life when they know what Christianity means. If we begin with social justice in the abstract and a new order of society we shall be liable to talk at cross purposes. As Christians we should be primarily interested in those reforms which are against our own interests, because they are the needs of which we are least likely to be aware. But while it is easy enough to join hands on any particular issue

with those whose interests would be served, we must not allow ourselves to imagine that this is evangelization.

It was hoped that the outsider would come. If he did he did not hear a great deal about redemption or grace or the need for following Christ to crucifixion. There was even a faint suggestion sometimes that if only everybody were like us all would be well. Christianity "works" if people will only try it. Heaven help us. It would be good for some of us to be considered haters of the human race, misinformed though Tacitus of course was on that point. Let us hope that God will somehow use all the real devotion which has been put into this work for His own ends. Whatever the contribution of the Campaign towards a brave new world, it has at least created a new fellowship between ministers and clergy, and laity too, of all sorts, and brought new possibilities of making bridges between different groups of Christians and of learning from each other and seeking a common mind. And that is perhaps where we have to begin.

Mabel Burdess.

Manchester.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAN STANLEY AND "THE CHRISTIAN YEAR"

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

The letter of my honoured Dean about his uncle Dean Stanley's well-used copy of *The Christian Year*, which he has just presented to the Library of Pusey House, raises one or two points to which I venture to call attention.

Dean Stanley was born on December 13, 1815, so that when he bought this copy of the book, in January 1833, he was a Rugby schoolboy of just over seventeen. He went to Rugby at the end of January 1829, six months after Dr Arnold had come as Headmaster; he was promoted to Sixth Form in 1831, and won a scholarship at Balliol in November 1833. He stayed on at Rugby till the end of the following summer "half," and began his career at Oxford in October 1834.

He had a deep devotion to Dr Arnold which, in the words of his biographer, "rose from a schoolboy's awe to the height . . . of almost idolatrous veneration" (*Life*, by Prothero, i, 78). Here, I suggest, is the first cause of Dean Stanley's devotion to *The Christian Year*.

Thomas Arnold came up to Oxford from Winchester as a scholar of Corpus in 1811 and became at once a member of the brilliant little group of Corpus scholars of which John Keble

was the most famous. These two became great friends, a friendship which deepened when Arnold in 1815 became Keble's brother Fellow at Oriel. When Arnold's eldest son, Matthew, was born, in 1822, Keble was one of his godfathers. *The Christian Year* was first published in 1827, but most of it had been written some years before, and in 1823 a few very intimate friends had been allowed to see the poems in manuscript. Keble, as is well known, had no wish to have them published in his lifetime. Arnold was one of those who saw the book in 1823, and he wrote: " It is my firm opinion that nothing equal to them exists in our language: the wonderful knowledge of Scripture, the purity of heart, and the richness of poetry which they exhibit, I never saw paralleled. If they are not published, it will be a great neglect of doing good " (*Life*, by Stanley, 2nd ed., 1844, i, 67). It seems clear that Stanley's purchase of the book in January 1833 must have been due to Arnold's influence.

The Oxford Movement began much later in that year. Keble's sermon was preached on July 14 and the *Tracts for the Times* began in the following September. There was no hubbub till later, and Arnold had not yet become such a fierce hater of the Movement as he showed himself in 1836. Before Stanley had ever seen Keble, and during his last year at Rugby, Stanley had learnt to honour his name; see a letter to an unnamed friend already asking " much about Keble " and whether he was angry with Arnold's pamphlet on Church Reform of 1832 (*Life of Stanley*, i, 93). This reverence, I submit, Stanley can have learnt only from his headmaster, who was for so long Keble's devoted friend.

Years later, in 1855, Dean Stanley's sister, Mary, led a party of fifty nurses to the Crimea; they were attached to the naval hospital at Therapia. Its chaplain complained to Miss Stanley that one of her nurses had lent a sick midshipman a publication " of a very improper tendency: parts of it he highly disapproved, parts of it he did not understand." It turned out to be a *Christian Year*, and next Sunday the chaplain preached against the nurses in their presence for " creeping in unawares." The Dean's " blood boiled at such fiendish folly and stupidity," he wrote, and he believed that his sister's secession to Rome in the next year " was accelerated, if not finally caused, by Protestant bigotry and intolerance " (*op. cit.*, i, 492, 3). There is an interesting exchange of letters in 1856 between Mr Keble and the Dean on p. 482 of the same volume in which Dr Stanley twice quotes *The Christian Year*.

I am, Sir,
Yours, etc.,
S. L. Ollard.

8, The Cloisters,
Windsor Castle.

BISHOP HAMPDEN'S BAMPTON LECTURES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Some protest seems called for against the astonishingly unsympathetic tone of Mr Brade's "Re-review" of Bishop Hampden's Lectures (which I ventured, in a recent Boyle Lecture, to describe as "one of the few courses of 'Bamptons' which are of real and permanent value").

In some respects, it is true, the Bishop's "intellectual position is such as would not now be found in any quarter." But his chief now outmoded view—his ultra-conservative position as to the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures—was shared by all those of his day who made any pretensions to orthodoxy, very peculiarly by all the Tractarians.

Withal he is, in his deepest points of view, astonishingly modern (in the best sense). He is quite in line with one of the chief reconstructive ideas of that critical and revisionist orthodoxy which is fast coming in like a flood-tide in many quarters at home and abroad, and both within and outside the Anglican communion. Indeed, he was (in this country, at any rate) the earliest pioneer of this line of thought—that is to say, of the view, on which our new Archbishop of Canterbury lays such emphasis, that God reveals Himself in His *acts*. This is precisely what Hampden meant by his stressing of "Divine facts." Necessarily and rightly he took "the term 'fact' in a very wide sense." He knew that God's "acts" must include (most importantly of all) His inward and unseen acts in and on the souls of men; and, along with this point, he recognized too that the "fact," if it is to be effectively recognized as a true "act of God," must needs include for us some measure of theological interpretation. Nevertheless, it remains, even so, a radically different thing from those intellectual theorizings which constitute "doctrines" proper. Hampden's real quarrel was with the forcing of the precise letter of them on all would-be believers. He would not have been roused to protest against these intellectualizations if everyone had been frankly acknowledged to be free to formulate for himself in his own way such of them as he might find necessary. That is, I presume, the fundamental attitude of all who are genuinely "critical" as well as (in aspiration) "Catholic." Most of us would indeed find more truth in the historic dogmatic tradition than did the Bishop; but the problem, as we put it to ourselves, remains always, what, and how much, truth can we find in any given dogma, however fundamental a one it may be? And when Hampden says "in the Scripture itself there are no doctrines," he is, once more, standing squarely shoulder to shoulder with Archbishop Temple when he denies that there is any such thing as a revealed *doctrine*.

Of course, it must be admitted (i) that the Bishop was far from appreciating the true intellectual merits of, at any rate, the greater Schoolmen; Rashdall had not yet arisen to vindicate them. But, though he might have acknowledged a greater measure of truth than he did in their Realism, yet at bottom his unqualified hostility to this comes to no more, in substance, than Professor Clement Rogers' protest in a recent article against a literal hypostatizing of the connotation of every noun that we find it convenient to use. And (ii) he was of course not duly alive to the importance of the visible Church—in common with nearly all those of his contemporaries who did not go all lengths with the new Tractarian departure. But it is difficult to see why a due " conception of a Church indwelt by the Spirit and guided into truth " should necessarily have made him any more sympathetic to (let us say) Transubstantiation, utterly abhorrent as that was to practically all the seventeenth-century High Churchmen.

To cut matters (most unduly and lamentably) short, it would be a disaster if your " Re-review " should deter any from reading these admirable " Bamptons." They are, I would maintain, one of some three or four nineteenth-century works all grossly neglected and all indispensable to the understanding of the true inwardness of modern movements in English theology.

N. E. Egerton Swann.

St Margaret Pattens Church,
City of London.
May, 1942.

Mr Brade writes:

" The fault with Bishop Hampden seems to be that he never understood the implications of what he was saying. His wholesale condemnation of all the formulation of Christian thought in the Creed and by the General Councils, and his apparent narrowing down of really valid intellectual truth to such spheres as can be dealt with by the ' Baconian induction,' make the mental processes which induced him to subscribe to any Articles of Religion whatever something of a mystery to the reader. There is little in his book to suggest that he aspires in any way to be the pioneer of a rationalistic ' modernist ' movement. And what he means by denying that the Creeds and Articles express ' affirmative belief ' and in what sense he accepts them, as he does accept them, are matters of obscurity, as are also the nature and scope of his ' Divine facts.' ' Facts ' that cannot without defacement be put into words in order to be transmitted to other people and other generations would not seem to be of any particular value or interest, especially when, as in the case of the Christian religion, they include alleged historical happenings in our world of time and space. On the other side we have

the obvious truth that the Church from the time of the Apostles onwards has always held that not only the bare happenings but also their meaning, or at least that part of it which is necessary for the salvation of human beings, have been divinely guaranteed and handed on from age to age. This seems to be attested by the whole of ecclesiastical history. This is the only reasonable basis upon which subscription to formularies can be demanded at all as a condition of Church membership. But here is a deep contradiction between his theories and his conduct as priest and bishop which Dr Hampden does not seem to realize and which his remarks about 'human Christianity' (whatever that may be) and the non-implication of 'affirmative belief' are entirely adequate to reconcile. He seems, moreover, to have felt himself injured when looked upon with suspicion as a rationalizing liberal.

"The whole question, however, for those who wish to follow it up, is dealt with in a masterly manner by Dean Church in the ninth chapter of his *Oxford Movement*, and nothing really needs to be added to what he says in that place. Dr Pusey's booklet, mentioned in the 'Re-review,' is on the same lines, and may be consulted with profit by the curious."

CONCERNING ECONOMICS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Peck cannot be allowed to get away with the contention that there is no generally accepted economic theory, so that anyone purporting to write as an economist is merely expressing personal and peculiar views, and anyone else might as well invent their own economic theory, as he does. I tried last time briefly to indicate the scope of the subject; this Mr Peck ignores. An undergraduate can read economics at London, Cambridge, Oxford or Manchester, to name four of the leading English schools, and move from one to the other within a generally accepted methodology and body of theory. The "notorious" lack of it is simply untrue. The disagreements between economists are such as one would expect to find in any live and developing subject. To take refuge in them is as valid as for a British Israelite or a Jehovah's Witness to support his peculiar biblical views by referring to the "notorious" disagreements of biblical scholars. Moreover, the tools of economic theory are as relevant to a Socialist or Fascist economy as to a liberal-capitalist or a monopoly-capitalist one (which is why I quoted Germany), and do not become obsolete with the end of the expansive period of liberal capitalism as Mr Peck assumes. Soviet Russia has undergone much unnecessary suffering in the

process of learning what had been thought to be the principles of " bourgeois " economics; fortunately the chances of Mr Peck and the school to which he refers having the power to plunge us into chaos are small indeed. But there are dangers from other quarters—all kinds of vested interests—and Mr Peck and his school would render a real service to the Christian community by helping to spread some accurate economic knowledge among it, instead of increasing the confusion.

What Mr Peck regards as having it both ways is in fact a statement of the problem; this, so far from being a bolt from Dr Barlow's blue, has been in mind for some years, namely (writing as a Christian) the relation of Christian doctrine to the work of the different sciences, especially economics; the limits of their relative autonomy and the working out of a new synthesis to replace the one that proved inadequate in the Middle Ages. I wish someone would write a B.D. thesis on the relation of a Christian anthropology to economic theory, but it must be someone who understands the economics as well as the theology. There is no problem to Mr Peck, for there is no economics; but I should like him to explain how *as a theologian* he arrives at the statements in par. 5 of his letter or at the analysis of the finances of the hat factory on p. 34 of the book that began this controversy. If he can overthrow the whole subject of economics his name will indeed go down to history. My root contention is that before being able to do so, it is necessary to understand the subject and what those trained in it think they are doing. I am not concerned whether he will accept any direct guidance from me; but I should like to refer him to para. 2 of p. 58 of Dr Temple's recent Penguin Special, *Christianity and Social Order.*

RONALD PRESTON.

SELL THAT THOU HAST

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Your terrifying warning to be brief allows me only a short précis in reply to Canon Smyth.

(1) No parody of my article can alter what I believe to be a fact, that the Church's riches are her own greatest hindrance to-day. My suggestion is designed to free her from *all* the world's " isms," Right or Left, and to make her the detached, unworldly body which the New Testament depicts.

(2) If history has any meaning, it may be that the choice which political events seem to be forcing on the Church comes from God after all.

(3) Much of Canon Smyth's letter is merely an attempt to " discredit the witness "; but he might have mentioned that in 1924 I graduated in theology—at Oxford !

(4) Our blessed Lord's recorded temptations are surely a sufficient evidence that He would not compromise with the world's system of His day—and by that I did not mean the contemporary equivalent of capitalism.

(5) After such an entirely negative letter, perhaps Canon Smyth will kindly give us one positive suggestion to cure the evil which he grudgingly admits in his last paragraph.

Yours sincerely,

R. H. LeMessurier.

"THE CONTINUITY OF PENTECOST"

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

The mention by Mr Hugh Ross Williamson of the readings appointed in the lectionary for Pentecost calls to mind the observation by E. G. King[1] that if, as Büchler[2] had already demonstrated, the Pentateuch was read on successive Sabbaths over a three-year cycle, probably until about A.D. 200, the reading for the first Sabbath of Siwan[3] in the first year of the cycle would be Gen. xi. Thus the story of the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues was read on one of the days of Pentecost, and would seem to have had a clear connexion with the gift of tongues described in Acts.

An interesting speculation may be based on this connexion of reading and event. If the form of the tradition of the gift of tongues and the cloven tongues of fire in Acts was moulded by the readings in temple and synagogue, it might well be deduced that the reading from the law on the occasion of this event was the story of the tower of Babel—*i.e.*, that the first Whitsunday occurred in a first year of the triennial cycle. The form of the story may, of course, have been influenced at a later date by the connexion of the tower of Babel story with this period of the year, but it is possible that this influence was felt at the very beginning.

If, then, the first Whitsunday took place in a first year of the triennial cycle, we may relate this to the probability that the date when Jesus spoke in the synagogue at Nazareth[4] was the last Sabbath of Ḥeshwan, also in a first year of the triennial cycle. Isa. lxi, 1-2 is the Haftarah for this date.[5] This would

---

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, v., p. 205.

[2] *Jewish Quarterly Review*, v., pp. 420*ff.*, vi, pp. 1*ff.*

[3] *Jewish Encyclopædia*, xii., between pp. 256, 257. The chart here places the reading on the last Sabbath of Iyyar, as five Sabbaths are counted in Iyyar as against four counted by King.

[4] Luke iv, 16.

[5] *Jewish Encyclopædia, loc. cit.*

mean that Jesus began His ministry about the end of October in one first year of the cycle and ended it at the Passover in another first year of the cycle, the ministry thus lasting about two and a half years. It is interesting that this would indicate a chronology close to the Johannine record, giving three Passovers during the period of Jesus' ministry.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

34, LYNDEWOOD ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE.

"THE HISTORIC MISSION OF JESUS"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I should be grateful if I might be allowed to comment briefly on Mr G. O. Williams' review of my book on *The Historic Mission of Jesus* in your May number.

His complaint that my conclusions are disappointing is a judgment depending so much on the personal preferences of the reader that I fear I cannot deal with it. Nor can I, for similar reasons, take up his challenge about primary and secondary issues, and the proportionate distribution of space between this and that piece of evidence. I would observe only that, in allotting space, regard has been paid to the demands of clarity as well as to those of intrinsic importance.

But the charge of "inadequacy," of "failing to do justice to the gospels," etc., is a more serious matter. I had hoped that the scrupulous objectivity of my method would have secured me against the danger of such criticisms. That my findings make a somewhat different impression from that given by the gospels themselves, *as they now stand*, is not to be wondered at, having regard to the date and circumstances of their composition. I cannot therefore accept this particular comment as in any way damaging my case. In illustration, I should reply to his statement that the evidence of political interest on our Lord's part is "meagre and inconclusive" by first of all demurring strongly to the latter term altogether, and by then observing that the evidence is naturally less prominent than it might have been because, when the gospels were written, all hope that Israel might take the path pointed out by Jesus as the right one had long had to be abandoned, and a very different situation had to be faced by His followers (pp. 353 *f.*). Moreover, I differ confidently from Mr Williams in his minimization of the political unrest in our Lord's own lifetime: but I must not ask for space here in order to justify my view.

I do not understand why Mr Williams quotes Luke xvi, 16 = Matt. xi, 12 *f.* against me, seeing that on pp. 130 and 232 of my book I say the very thing which he seems to reproach me

with omitting. But in his various remarks about "power," he seems to me to be selecting the less central category, in preference to the more central, as the key to the problem of the Kingdom. For the notion of pure "power" is clearly a less true and less vital notion than that of personal reconciliation: and although it is often introduced in Scripture—owing largely to the Jewish proneness to use it—it need not for that reason necessarily be given, in our final interpretation, precedence over what is clearly a more fundamental category of thought. Mr Williams begs the question when he refers to "the true doctrine of the Kingdom" as something different from my own: and I find it hard to take seriously his insistence on the *order* of the two clauses in the Lord's Prayer about God's Kingdom and God's Will as vitally significant.

He is, of course, entirely at liberty to prefer my friend Dr Vincent Taylor's interpretation of the Atonement to my own. But I do not know why Dr Taylor's opinion is entitled to be treated as a "demonstration" any more than mine is. If the word "sacrifice," used with reference to our Lord's death, is taken strictly (as it long was—and that unquestioningly), I do not see how one can claim that the idea is not less ethical than that of a moving appeal to repentance.

Finally, in his charges of inadequacy, Mr Williams makes no allowance for the important distinction between the precise content of our Lord's teaching during His ministry on earth and the Church's subsequent interpretation of the significance of that ministry.

I am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
C. J. Cadoux.

179, Woodstock Road,
Oxford.
May 26, 1942.

The Rev. G. O. Williams writes:

"In my review I stated that in my opinion Dr Cadoux's findings were inadequate as an account of the teaching of Jesus because they appeared to me to omit certain elements which are present in Gospel sayings the authenticity of which Dr Cadoux himself does not question. In dealing with his treatment of the Kingdom I said that Dr Cadoux appeared mistaken in excluding from our Lord's teaching the vital idea of the Kingdom appearing in the present as the power of God, making possible man's salvation by providing him with the ability to perform God's will. The point of my quotation of Lk. xvi, 16=Mt. xi, 12 *f.* was clearly to show that this truth was not incompatible with a full emphasis upon the necessity of human effort; Dr Cadoux does indeed deal with this passage in the contexts to

which he refers, but on neither occasion does he attach to it its full significance. The result is that the doctrine of divine grace is exiled from its true place in our Lord's teaching and made a part of "the Church's subsequent interpretation" of the ministry. I alluded to the order of the clauses in the Lord's Prayer because that seemed to me to be the most concise way of stating what needed to be said; the suggestion there made is fully borne out by the Parables of the Seed Growing of Itself and the Treasure in the Field, as well as by the saying which compares the Kingdom to a gift which must be received as children receive gifts, not of merit but by grace.

In dealing with Dr Cadoux's treatment of the Passion I gave my opinion that he had done less than justice to our Lord's teaching by excluding His view of His death as a Sacrifice. I cannot accept the suggestion that "taken strictly" the idea of sacrifice is less ethical than "a moving appeal to repentance"; but in any case we are not concerned with what is "less ethical" or "more ethical," but with what Jesus taught. Once more, in Dr Cadoux's treatment, what was an original part of our Lord's teaching has been ousted from its proper place, against the weight of the evidence, to become a part of the Church's interpretation.

When it is claimed that by objective critical methods an attempt has been made to determine the original content of our Lord's teaching, it is the first duty of the reader to inquire whether any part of that teaching, as found in the Gospel materials, has been dismissed from the critical restatement. If it be judged that such is the case, I do not see how a charge of inadequacy can fail to be brought, and the consequent "disappointment," far from being a judgment depending upon "the personal preferences of the reader," is a very natural reaction of his critical faculties.

As regards the degree of political unrest in Palestine and the extent to which political interests conditioned our Lord's ministry, I must content myself in answer to Dr Cadoux with reminding him that what I did was not to *minimize* these factors—*i.e.*, "reduce them to, or estimate them at, the smallest possible amount or degree"—but to give it as my judgment that in the sentence which I quoted from his book he was unduly exaggerating them."

LESSER FEASTS IN THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Will some liturgist kindly say whether or not the Collect of a Lesser Feast falling on a day when a Red Letter Feast is postponed should be said after the Collect of the Day?

The position seems to be this. According to the 1928 Book, the first English authority to recognize liturgical observance of Lesser Feasts, " the Collect of the Lesser Day may be added after the Collect of the Holy-day, unless it be a Principal Day." " On Principal Feasts, that is to say, Christmas Day, the Epiphany, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday, the only Collect used as the Collect of the Day shall be that of the Feast." This seems to imply that the Collect of a Black Letter Saint may be used on, say, Maundy Thursday, which no one would dream of doing. On the other hand, the " Table to regulate the Service when two Holy-days fall upon the same day " directs that a Red Letter Day falling in Holy Week, Easter, or Whitsun Week, " shall be either prætermitted or transferred." It is therefore forbidden to use the Collect after the Collect of the Day. You may transfer the service or omit it entirely for the current year. The assumption is that the associations of, *e.g.*, Easter and Pentecost are so overpowering as to drive out all others. Is it logical to commemorate St Aldhelm when it falls on Whitsun Monday, as in 1942, whereas a Red Letter Day which clashed could be omitted entirely, or transferred but not marked in this way? Is it not better to omit all reference to the Lesser Feast in such a case?

The rubric in the 1928 Book which I quoted to begin with has no parallel in the Scottish or South African Prayer Books. It is possible that it was added without realization of its implications, especially as the " Deposited Book " was put out with no previous experience of how it would work in practice.

The year 1943 gives a striking example of the Book's failure to provide for all emergencies. St Mark falls on Easter Day, SS. Philip and James on the following Saturday. The rubrics order that both shall be transferred to the Tuesday after Low Sunday.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NATURE OF CATHOLICITY. By Daniel T. Jenkins. Faber and Faber. 6s.

This is one of the most important books upon the doctrine of the Church and the problem of Reunion that have appeared for some years. The writer is a Congregational minister who expounds the doctrine of the Ministry from within the classical Reformed tradition with so rare an understanding of "Catholic" views and so deep an insight into the theological issues that the eirenic value of his book should be very great. His work is timely in view of the frequent talk to the effect that Church order is merely a matter of convenience ("Episcopacy is a valuable form of Church government") and that the introduction of theological considerations on the subject hinders reunion. For Mr Jenkins shows that the Free Churches are not likely to be won by this kind of talk and that episcopacy can win acceptance only if it has an imperative spiritual claim. While his criticism of Anglican thought is searching, he shows that a theological approach can bring us very close together. His use of the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' discussion of "Apostolicity" in his *The Fourth Gospel* is specially valuable.

Mr Jenkins notes a revival of the idea of churchmanship throughout English religion. A debt of gratitude is owed, he says, to the High Anglican school for its long upholding of the reality of the Church as the Body of Christ; but this school has been wont to uphold Church order not on any real theological grounds, but on the strength of a purely historical appeal. Recently, however, a new tendency has appeared within this school, to show the meaning of Church order as the expression of the Gospel of God and to link it with the Messianic redemption; and this tendency enables "Catholic" and "Reformed" theologians to draw far nearer together in fruitful discussion. Hence Mr Jenkins' book, whose principal chapters are entitled "The Apostolic Succession," "The Burden of the Apostolic Testimony," "The Ordinance of God," "Qualities of the Catholic Church."

The Church exists wherever Jesus Christ is Lord. He alone is the *esse* of the Church. He is known through the witness of the Apostles to Him, a witness that is found in the Scriptures and interpreted by the Holy Spirit who brings the Church, as it seeks Jesus Christ in the Scriptures, under the rule of God. Mr Jenkins passes on to consider the place of the Apostles, and it is here that he quotes the work of Hoskyns. The Apostles had authority because of That to which they bore witness, and not because it was Apostles who were the witnesses. The Bishops, described in the Epistles of St Ignatius, were important because

through them the apostolic witness to Jesus Christ was preserved. The Church is Catholic through being Apostolic, and it is Apostolic not through the technical status of its Ministry but through being brought ever and anew beneath the Lordship of Jesus Christ as witnessed to by the Apostles. True " succession " therefore consists in the renewed witness and message whereby the Lordship of Christ is realized rather than in the structure of the Ministry which may—or may not—bear the witness. Sacraments, Ministry, Scripture, Creeds are the means whereby the Lordship of Christ is asserted, but they can be perverted into the means of a false security that usurps the divine Lordship. Thus Church order cannot *per se* be the expression of the Gospel; there is ever a tension between it and the Gospel. And if Protestants need to learn the great importance of Church order, Anglicans need to take the fact of the tension far more seriously. " The life of the Church on earth is a series of constantly repeated acts of public repentance, of examining herself critically under the Word of God and re-forming herself ever and anew in the light of that Word."

None the less the structure of the Church's order is of essential and theological importance. The Liturgy is the Church's " chief means of making manifest Christ's Lordship in her midst." The Apostolic Ministry is essential to the Church's existence because its proclamation brings the Church into submission to Jesus Christ who came in the flesh: " where the Apostolic Ministry does not exist the Church has not the form of Catholicity." The Independent Church in historic Congregationalism is a true expression of Catholicity not because of its isolation but because of the presence within it of Word, Sacraments, Apostolic Ministry. Their presence is the bond of unity, a bond needing expression in Synods wherein the Ministers link the local Churches. Here Mr Jenkins mentions the significance, though he hesitates to define it clearly, of the Episcopate. The Lordship of Jesus must penetrate to every corner of Church life; and Anglican readers may well pay heed to Mr Jenkins' description of the church-meeting of the Congregationalists, and to his criticism of the Anglican failure to give true freedom and privilege to the laity.

In his concluding chapter, " Catholicity in England Today," he puts his finger upon some weaknesses both in the Free Churches and in the Church of England, and he gives some timely warnings. Let us beware of Reunion along untheological lines and of a drift towards a united national Christianity that shirks the deep questions concerning fellowship in the Gospel. Because of these dangers " we must be grateful for the intransigent, if occasionally somewhat arrogant, attitude which the Church of England has frequently taken up in regard to such matters as intercommunion and the mutual recognition of ministries. It has at least been a salutary reminder to us that the Order of

Christ's Church is of divine appointment and is not to be adjusted to our human convenience." The true line for future discussion will be the meaning of the Apostolic testimony and its relation to the life of the Church, and here " it is impossible to exaggerate the significance of the appearance of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' *The Fourth Gospel*."

Our gratitude to Mr Jenkins is so great that we pass with reluctance to criticism. His thesis seems vulnerable at several points. Is not the subject of Tradition dropped too lightly on pp. 44-45 ? If the local Church represents the universal Church (p. 107), does not this fact demand expression in the structure of the Ministry ? Mr Jenkins speaks of the minister representing the local Church in the councils of the general Church (p. 108); is not the reverse idea also demanded by the New Testament doctrine of the ecclesia ? Is it a fault in Catholicism " to conceive of the Church alone as attaining to the fullness of manhood and of the individual members as merely sharing in that manhood " ? (p. 121). Ephesians iv, 11-16 suggests that the manhood of Christ is corporately realized. Above all, is it not a narrowed interpretation of the Apostles that makes " proclamation " almost the whole content of their office ? For their witness included pastoral rule and care, and it is here that Mr Jenkins' picture of them needs enlargement. If fuller worth is given to the pastoral office of the Apostles, will not our final doctrine of the Ministry include not only what Mr Jenkins has shown us but also the truths expounded in the seventh chapter of Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood* ? Here are questions which seem to need asking and answering before agreement is carried farther.

A. M. Ramsey.

Durham.

A History of Science. By Sir W. C. Dampier. Cambridge University Press. 25s.

The appearance of a new and revised edition of Sir William Dampier's *History of Science* is timely and important. The two editions, in 1929 and 1930, proved that the book was valuable; and it has long been out of print. Moreover, interest in the subject is plainly increasing. Tendencious and slipshod work like Mr Crowther's Pelican volumes, and a brilliant *tour-de-force* by Professor Hogben —almost equally tendencious and in places purely mythological[1]—have popularized it. An accurate record by a qualified scientist may prevent the story from being distorted by ignorance or exploited by propagandists.

Sir William has indeed many qualifications for the task which he is now continuing. He is himself a scientist of distinction,

[1] As for example in its account of Jung the early botanist, *Science for the Citizen*, p. 924.

expert in his own branch of research, and a man of wide interests. Moreover, he has lived and worked in close touch with a peculiarly brilliant group—Sir J. J. Thomson, Lord Rutherford, Professor Bateson, Sir Arthur Eddington and many others—and has thus known at first hand some of the greatest of recent achievements. Finally, his book is obviously the result not only of his own studies but of discussion with and advice from specialists in many other fields. It is thus authoritative, as no other recent history can claim to be, and it is throughout written with a consciousness of the relevance of science to contemporary thought and especially to philosophy and religion.

This third edition has been brought up to date not only by the additional chapter of more than fifty pages describing the progress between 1930 and 1940, but by many insertions and revisions in the previously published book. To describe it as is done on the cover as " in effect a new book " is hardly justifiable, for not only is the year 1929 still constantly mentioned as the date now reached (*e.g.*, on pp. 211, 294, 372, 485), but several of the verdicts then delivered which ought to have been at least modified still stand as final: the perspective from which most of the work of the twentieth century is discussed is that of ten years ago. Thus neither in biology and genetics nor in philosophy do we find adequate recognition of the most recent work that has been done either here or in America; and the progress in psychology and sociology is almost ignored.

But this is a criticism amounting to a warning that the age and outlook of the author cannot be eliminated. He has a strongly marked personal equation, and his book reveals, as any treatment of so huge a theme must reveal, his own aptitudes, preferences and limitations. As a history of physics and kindred subjects the book is much stronger than in its treatment of biology: Newton fills many pages, Malpighi and Stensen are scarcely recorded, Linnæus is mentioned twice, Bertrand Russell at least a dozen times. Except in Genetics the botanical and zoological sections of the book are weak, and this gravely impairs the value of its treatment of philosophy and religion. Thus, for example, Whitehead and Eddington are quoted continually; G. E. Moore and C. D. Broad are freely mentioned; Alexander and Lloyd Morgan, whose work is theologically at least as valuable, are not mentioned at all—except for one misleading reference to Lloyd Morgan as a psychologist.

It is perhaps an amiable weakness which makes Sir William devote more space to his ancestor William Dampier the traveller than to the immeasurably more important contemporary John Ray. But even a Cambridge man will at times wonder whether the identification of scientific progress not merely with England and with Cambridge but with Trinity College is not carried a little too far.

These limitations indicate the outlook of the book so far as its

bearing upon theology is concerned. In the main this reflects the discussions between Russell and Whitehead or Whitehead and Eddington ten years ago: the confidence just beginning to be shaken that with patience and good temper a generous and progressive conservatism will overcome present difficulties and lead to the acceptance of a modernized, tolerant and inclusive Anglicanism; the fear, admitted in the last chapter to be false, that the obscurantism of Tennessee will prove a serious handicap to scientific expansion; the hesitant belief that "the conceptual mechanism which for two hundred and fifty years has interpreted the structure of the natural world . . . will fail and we shall be left face to face with the awful mystery which is reality."

But it is not as a direct contribution to theology or even to philosophy that the book is important. Its value is that it surveys the development of science with care and a measure of fullness, that it is an admirable exposition of the development of physical knowledge and theory, and that it interprets with first-hand and authoritative competence the work of many of the most important and most difficult modern specialists. For those who believe that an accurate understanding of science is an essential element in an incarnational philosophy and therefore in a Christian theology, the book is of real and permanent value. But perhaps it ought not to be called a History of Science.

C. E. Raven.

Cambridge.

Conditions of Peace. By E. H. Carr. Macmillan. 12s. 6d.

The Foundations of Peace. By W. R. Matthews. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 2s. 6d.

People look so eagerly to the picture of a better future after the war, and are so starved of ideas by a Government preoccupied with the battle, that these two books will have had a warm welcome. Professor Carr, whose war-time associations with *The Times* and the ruling group behind it are well known, has a special claim to attention; while Dr Matthews' book, shorter and more general in its treatment, is significantly on much the same lines. Professor Carr understands the war. Its causes cannot be put in simple terms of the wickedness and greed of Germany or of a crusade against Fascism. It springs from a deep crisis of civilization, from a revolution—as he describes it—against the beliefs in liberal democracy, national self-determination and *laissez-faire* economics. It amounts to a loss of faith in what the West held good. Mass democracy is not the oligarchic democracy of the nineteenth century and the pretence that it is has broken down; the problems of the nation only begin with its independence, which must now be checked by loyalty to larger groupings; *laissez-faire* economics produced injustices that the

modern State dare not tolerate. Russia, Germany and Italy show the revolt in practice; we ourselves cannot escape it.

Reconstruction on the basis of this revolution has its home and foreign policies, which ought to be prepared now. A nation which lacks a united life and energy through failing to solve its own social problems will lack the vigour, and the right, to lead and settle other nations and Continents. For this country Professor Carr prescribes a planned economy, a great series of public works including housing, the subsidising of a minimum standard of living, and the maintenance of the war-time system of industrial controls. The money for it? If you can make unproductive armaments you can make roads and houses. It only demands public recognition that the public works are as worthy a national objective as war itself. What is most striking in this part of the book is its slight regard for checks on the increased power given the planning executive and for preserving the freedom of the person. This main problem of the planning society, for all who wish to maintain the Christian political tradition, is almost entirely neglected. It is surely a sign of danger.

In turning to Europe this important point is made: the necessity, which was not observed at Versailles, of keeping distinct the ending of the war and the founding of the peace. For one thing it will be impossible to draw good frontiers until the war's permanent modifications of every State's economic system and needs have been correctly noted; for another the psychological advantage of letting war-time hatreds die down before making the final peace is obvious. We begin, then, by assuming control of conquered territories. At once large-scale relief measures will start, which will mean the international ordering of Europe's railways and transport. Relief will lead on to a general restoration of Europe's industry, agriculture and trade. For these tasks the maintenance of war-time devices are again essential. We must not make the 1918 mistake of allowing the Allied Command to break up so that freed nations can take individual revenges. Allied supply arrangements, like those for pooling raw materials and joint purchasing, must also be kept during the reconstruction period. On their foundations a European Relief Commission and European Transport and Reconstruction Corporations should be established under a grand European Planning Authority. This machinery would be based on the " principle of equal co-operation between peoples, not of national or racial predominance." It is his hold on this principle that makes Professor Carr's chapter on " Britain and Germany " the wisest and most useful piece of writing on this question which has yet gained wide publicity. One of his most imaginative proposals is that while the public debts of the defeated nations must just be written off, the " small man's savings, even in Germany, should be guaranteed by a Bank of

Europe. For the thrifty of all nations to know in the immediate post-war period that their savings depended on an international bank would give them a vested interest in the growth of international order. It is the merit of the whole discussion that it supports no doctrinaire system like Federal Union, to be clamped down on Europe with little regard for circumstances. First, he argues, get the Relief and Planning Corporations working. If they succeed you will find that your international order has grown up naturally without the cramping effects of wearing a political strait-waistcoat from birth. Afterwards is the time for giving legal and political forms to an international economic order, and for devising its supports and sanctions—an international police force, for example.

Professor Carr's schemes for the future are reasonable; if they were carried out one would expect the world to be a rather better place than it is. The one trouble is that all of them demand sacrifice, sometimes heavy sacrifice. To balance world trade, for instance, he has to ask America to import agricultural products in exchange for her manufactured goods. Will the almost self-sufficient United States do this to any great extent? Again, he sets as an essential for his reconstruction system its unselfish backing by Britain, the United States and Soviet Russia. Can we be sure that any new Europe will be formed which will satisfy and attract the support of these three Powers together? If we take only his social policies for Britain we must ask: "How much of his standard of living will Smith, returned from the army to a good job which he believes to be secure, sacrifice so that Brown, an engineer then unwanted for all the large wages he earned during the war, can be sure of steady employment?" Changing incentive from self-interest to "service" is a major spiritual revolution. Professor Carr is aware of this: "The essential nature of the crisis through which we are passing is neither military, nor political, nor economic, but moral. A new faith in a new moral purpose is required to reanimate our political and economic system." Unfortunately it is just when the writer looks round for a moral purpose that his book becomes least satisfactory. He presents us with the designs of a gleaming post-war machine, but is clearly in doubt over what spirit to pour into the engine. He considers Christianity and Communism, without vast enthusiasm for either, and thinks, it appears, that we could do with a little of both. Professor Carr of the newly enlightened Right, in company with Mr Kingsley Martin of the long (they think) enlightened Left, is a man of goodwill seeking for a "dynamic," or, in other words, for a God to approve and advance man's policies. Dr Matthews says the last word on this: "Religious movements cannot be called forth at will, nor can they be produced to meet the needs of statesmen. The Spirit, like the wind, bloweth where it listeth."

Manchester. Walter James.

Shall our Children Live or Die ? A reply to Lord Vansittart on the German problem. By Victor Gollancz. Gollancz. 2s. 6d.

The controversy between Vansittartites and anti-Vansittartites on the enigma of the " German mind " has by now become a well-worn theme. Both sides are apt to present rival selective interpretations of history with the moral passion often associated with half-truths. Vansittart claims to be writing with hard-headed reason, but his moral passion, as Mr Gollancz points out, turns in the end into a play on the emotion of hatred. (Mr Gollancz has some shrewd psychological observations on the propaganda of appeals to hatred, showing how hatred of the evil in an opponent may be made into an unacknowledged excuse for indulging our own primitive and self-assertive instincts.) But we wonder whether Mr Gollancz's own very genuine moral passion is not to some extent a means of oversimplifying the problem. Following Lenin, he diagnoses " imperialist wars " as the outcome of the competition for markets under monopoly capitalism, when the available sources of raw materials have been taken up, and industrial powers want to have markets and sources of raw materials under their own political control. Hence the pressure of great industrial and financial interests on governments to secure this control. The Germans are a gifted and energetic race whose industrial development came late; hence their sense that they have not had their share in the means of world economic power, a sense which shows itself in an aggressive urge to expansion. The only cure is to remove the conditions of national competition between monopoly capitalisms, under a system of international socialism.

Mr Gollancz is surely right to look for causes of German aggressiveness in history rather than in some overdose of original sin peculiar to the German race. The evidence that there is any necessary correlation between racial and psychological characteristics is of the slightest. As historical factors relevant to the situation, in addition to the lateness of Germany's economic expansion, I should suggest the comparative absence of lasting effects of Roman settlement; the late coming of Christianity in the north and east; the devastating effects of the Thirty Years' War; the fact that the Liberal movement of the nineteenth century was associated with the drive towards the national unity of the Reich rather than with cosmopolitan and free trade ideas; and above all, the lack of a tolerably long period of security in which the quieter and more stable qualities of mind could take firm root and grow. I have one further suggestion which I shall offer, since I have not yet seen it made in any of the voluminous literature on the subject, namely that a not negligible consideration may be the way in which German boys are accustomed to be waited on by their womenfolk at home and made to feel that they and their work are the centre

of the universe. Hence they are only too likely to grow up with something of the attitude to life of spoilt small boys; their convenience must be studied, they mustn't be teased, and they are bad losers. Factors such as these among others may produce psychological characteristics more deep-seated than Mr Gollancz allows. Nevertheless I believe that the balance of truth lies in his case against Vansittart. He performs a good service in bringing out the strength of the evidence for decent human behaviour and unwarlike feeling among ordinary people in Germany. But does he sufficiently meet Vansittart's question, why the "decent" Germans continually allow themselves to be ruled by assertive and aggressive groups, by saying that the old centres of power and vested interests should be dislodged? Certainly the grip of these powerful groups on the community has made any effective organized resistance inside Germany impossible, and it will be vital for the future to prevent these—or any other group—from acquiring such control and using it for aggressive expansion. Some system of international socialism (if the term be used fluidly and not tied to old clichés) may indeed offer the most hopeful framework for a solution. But does Mr Gollancz overestimate the power of a change of economic environment to produce a psychological change? Socialism must not be thought of as a "blessed word," but as an instrument which can only be made to work by the energy, intelligence, and good will of those working it. Here Mr Gollancz would agree, but the legacy of disillusion, hatred and exhaustion left by the war both in Germany and the occupied countries may be a greater obstacle than he allows. He thinks that the end of the war will be the occasion for a great release of constructive political energy. We hope he is right; but it may also release energies making for a relapse into anarchism. Readers of THEOLOGY may feel that in face of what may happen we shall need to look deeper than Mr Gollancz takes us for the sources of healing and constructive energy. Nevertheless his book is one which repays careful consideration from any concerned with the problems behind the present conflict.

DOROTHY M. EMMET.

MANCHESTER.

THE APOCALYPSE. By A. L. Maycock. Dacre Press. 5s.

It is a commonplace that the Apocalypse is a bewildering book to the commentator and to the ordinary Christian reader alike. Its idiom is even more foreign to modern ears than that of the rest of the New Testament writings, its symbols so allusive as well as elusive that no one is quite sure that he has detected their proper emphasis or exhausted their meaning. As Mr Maycock himself writes: "So easily is it misunderstood, so easily are its symbols misapplied, that all through the Christian ages

there have been writers who have viewed it, if not with suspicion and mistrust, at least with caution and with an unwillingness to probe too deeply into the possible significance of all its details " (p. 7). Nevertheless, embarrassing as it is, the book refuses to be dismissed. Just when it is on the point of being bowed out of the Canon as " sub-Christian " or as hotch-potch of Jewish-Christian apocalyptic it reasserts itself, and never more than at periods of crisis such as the present. Moreover, at a time when the meaning of eschatology has come into the foreground of biblical studies, it becomes clearer that the unity which we seek in the New Testament must not be a premature and superficial unity, achieved by excluding such elements as " Special Matthew," the Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Apocalypse, but a unity which is inclusive of them. Perhaps the general temper of the times may combine with the particular stage which New Testament studies have reached to advance our understanding of this book, and to recover it for the theology of the Church from the hands of charlatans.

It cannot be said, however, that Mr. Maycock helps us much along these lines. His comments upon the text of the Apocalypse, which is printed in sections, are written in the attractive style which we should expect from the author of *Nicholas Ferrar*, but they are too long to provide points for meditation and too brief to provide provocative exegesis, or to satisfy the reader that the interpretation which is given to the symbols is justifiable. We want to know the grounds upon which the " hidden manna " " may signify the Blessed Sacrament, and the ' white stone ' the regenerative graces of Holy Baptism " (p. 33). His aim is to show that the Apocalypse " embraces the whole course of history, not because it outlines a Christian philosophy of history, but because it displays the supernatural order penetrating, fulfilling and transcending the natural "—this is finely said—and also that it is a manual of instruction directly applicable to the Church, and to the individual Christian soul, of any age to guide them in their pilgrimage through the world. This may well be something which is demanded by the Apocalypse itself, since the same God who sends his Angel to reveal to John the " beatific vision " of the early chapters is later called " the Lord God of the holy prophets " (ch. xxii. 6), but in his anxiety to show the relevance of the Apocalypse to the present day the author has made important omissions which seriously limit the value of his book. He does not deal with the problem of eschatology at all, and he will have nothing to do with any historical allusions. All the symbols are to be interpreted of the Church, so that even Babylon becomes " the Church on its corrupt side." This gives to his comments a curiously introverted and moralizing tone. The fact that commentators in the past have written so much nonsense in attempting to identify the minute details of each symbol does not mean that the commen-

tator in the present can dispense with history altogether. Indeed Mr Maycock's own interpretation of " Babylon " becomes far more feasible if (with Dr Carrington in his book *The Meaning of the Revelation*, following Professor Milligan) " Babylon " is identified with the corrupt Church of Judaism.

It may be said of the New Testament writings as a whole that they reveal catholic truth not by avoiding history, but by laying bare the eternal work of God as it is perceived in particular historical situations, and the Apocalypse would seem to be no exception to this. F. D. Maurice was surely right in his approach to the book when he wrote: " I do not despair of seeing even this last book come forth, out of the hands of soothsayers and prognosticators, as a real lesson-book respecting the dealings of God with the nations, respecting the method and issues of His righteous government."

C. F. Evans.

Lincoln.

The Moral Blitz. By Bernard Causton. Secker and Warburg. 2s.

The author was for six years a British correspondent in Berlin and acquired an intimate insight into the situation in Nazi Germany, both politically and spiritually. He says he has written this book " in the belief that the British people have brains, and, despite frequent discouragement, prefer to use them." He also believes in the words of the last sentence of the book, that " England can save Europe better by her example than by her precepts."

The book, not setting forth any ideas about post-war reconstruction, nor trying to face mere facts in a realistic excursion, may be called a " converted book," although it is not in the ordinary sense a religious book. But is it not ridiculous to speak of a book as being " converted " ?

The author is not aware of what I mean; he sees only " the danger with a book of this kind, which tries to pack a great deal into a small compass, that the underlying issues may be stated in fine trenchant sentences that seem very impressive at first glance but leave the reader afterwards in a general haze and slight uncertainty as to what it all amounts to." The value of the book is indeed somewhat different from that of most books dealing with the world situation; it is *written inside the Church*, and will not be understood outside her. The judgment which the book brings to bear is Christian. It is its spirit of understanding that is converted; its point of view, therefore, is neither idealistic nor realistic.

I should like to prove the converted character of the book by some quotations. This seems to be the best way to review such a book:

(1) *Concerning Policy.*—" To ask why the opponents of Nazi paganism did not make common cause with England and undertake political opposition is almost like asking why Mr Churchill from sheer exasperation with the Chamberlain policy of appeasement did not join the Nazis."

" Why wash our dirty linen in public? After all it is the Germans who are our problem. But can we hope to solve that problem till we have solved our own? The two problems hang together. We have to cease using ' imperialism ' as a term of reproach. Power is the ultimate sanction of justice, and if neglected is monopolized by those who wreak injustice." " Democracy, if it is to survive, must have teeth and claws." " Nazi aggression has been unwittingly abetted by decadent perversions of ' Christian morality ' and ' Socialistic idealism ' in democratic countries."

" It is essential to realize that Hitler utilized " (I would say and utilizes) " and perverted the good to achieve the evil."

" Each nation's propagandists exploit the grievances of the other nation's Home Front. But whereas defects in Germany are a reflection on the Nazi régime, exposure of shortcomings here is positively welcome, for our New Order has yet to come. No wonder the Blimps shrank from the prospect."

(2) *Concerning the Church.* — " To repeat parrot-wise ' the Churches have failed,' instead of finding out what they are contributing, is not helping anybody but Hitler."

" People who applauded Niemoeller's martyrdom and are now amazed by his political loyalty seem to forget that he went to a concentration camp for his Faith, not for love of the British Empire."

" There are men so blinded to immediate reality by a consciousness of their own goodness that their very idealism is a free gift to Hitler."

" The harm done by Dr Buchman's gullibility is not easily effaced, for many of his followers still repeat the wishful optimism he once inculcated while cultivating the rich and the powerful."

" Because of their naïve belief in an all-sufficient gospel of Good Works and their abhorrence of Dogma with the realistic thinking that involves, they are typical exponents of Sabbath Christianity, of Sunday Socialism. They are the moral tradesmen of to-day, honourable enough never to give their customers short weight, but oblivious to anything that passes beyond their shop doors."

(3) *Conclusions.*—" Thousands have not sacrificed their lives to make England safe for the Blimps."

" ' Liberal Rationalists ' have made a pseudo-mystical and one-sided cult of Love, of a Jesus divorced from divine authority: in other words, a reflection of their own inferiority complex towards the fatherhood of God. As permanent ' rebels ' they

must identify the justifiable rebellion of the socially dispossessed with their own revolt against divine authority."

"England herself is undergoing a revolution in outlook in every department of life, not least the Church. Is it not the lesson of this war that England, who so long dissipated her power and neglected its proper use, is called upon to make it the instrument of God's justice and mercy?"

"Justice without mercy is injustice and breeds resentment, but mercy without justice encourages aggression. The two should be as inseparable as the Old and New Testament."

Theology alone is able and entitled to heal either the mad or the degenerate mind of the political and social powers. It is alone the Church which is authorized and empowered to teach the rulers of this world how the world is to be ruled. The first task always is *diagnosis*, and it is the easier, although a difficult enough, task; the other task, which we shall approach much slower and by God's gracious guidance alone, concerns *therapy*. We ought to be very cautious not to deal with therapy before diagnosis has been accomplished to a full extent. For that Mr Causton's book is an extraordinarily good guide.

HANS EHRENBERG.

WHITCHURCH.

SHORT NOTICE

THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT. By Evelyn Underhill. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

Mr Stuart Moore has put the many who loved to follow and read Miss Evelyn Underhill into his debt by printing this little book. It is in two parts: the first consists of five addresses on the "Fruits of the Spirit" given in Pleshey Retreat House in 1936, and the second of letters of direction to a number of young women students of Theology, formed by Miss Underhill into a Prayer Group in 1939.

One of Miss Underhill's great desires—it can be seen clearly in an earlier little book, *Abba*—was to make the life of prayer and of the spirit more vivid, real and forceful to all to whom she sought to present it, and she employed a wealth of illustrations of a topical everyday kind in her attempt to do this. Frequently the method is very successful, sometimes the reverse: both results are illustrated here. We see it at its best in the address on "Joy and Peace," when she is speaking of periods of darkness in prayer; "There is always a night shift, and sooner or later we are put on it. The praise does not cease with the fading of the light, but goes on through the spiritual night as well as the spiritual day. That is one of the meanings of the Church's night-office—of those Religious Orders rising in the dark to adore God." Less success-

ful is this: " Faithfulness and Goodness—they *are* doggy qualities. Fancy that as the Fruit of the Spirit. But then the Spirit is Love, and doggy love is a very good sort of love, humble, selfless and enduring."

The addresses are printed practically as they were spoken; up to a point, of course, they suffer from this, and no doubt some expressions, illustrations, and turns of phrase would be more effective if one could have heard them delivered. But no one will read these addresses without being the better for it, for they are full of wise and holy things. The letters to the Prayer Group, in the second part of the book, contain much simple and yet profound advice, and I at least found much of help and value in the Whitsun letter for 1940. It is encouraging to find the stress laid by so great a soul on the meaning and value of Abstinence in Lent, which is interpreted and treated in a way now quite unfashionable in Anglican circles, to the great loss of the Church. To read the two Lenten letters, for 1940 and 1941, would be a valuable preparation for Lent, 1943, for most of us. The price, for a little book of 70 pages, in paper covers, is a small sad comment on our times.

LLANDAFF. GLYN SIMON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

COMMUNITY SERVICE COMMITTEE: *Community in a Changing World* (3s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: G. Wilson Knight, *Chariot of Wrath* (10s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: A. C. Deane, *St Paul and His Letters* (7s. 6d.).

JENNINGS (CANTERBURY): Clew Garnet, *Our V Sign* (1s. 6d.).

MICHAEL JOSEPH: A. W. Hopkinson, *Parson's Progress* (10s. 6d.).

MOREHOUSE-GORHAM CO. (NEW YORK): W. Norman Pittenger, *Christian Faith and Life* (n.p.)—a manual of instruction and devotion.

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: C. S. Phillips, *A Little Companion to the Psalter* (2s. 6d.); A. E. Ikin, *Christian Education: The Next Step* (6d.).

NISBET: H. W. Robinson, *Redemption and Revelation* (12s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: S. Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death* (14s.); J. Baillie, *Invitation to Pilgrimage* (5s.).

PELICAN BOOKS: Norman Nicholson (Ed.), *An Anthology of Religious Verse* (9d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: W. Temple, *Palm Sunday to Easter* (1s. 6d.); G. F. Allen, *Law with Liberty* (5s.); F. A. Cockin, *Religion and the Modern Mood* (9d.).

S.P.C.K.: G. W. Broomfield, *Revelation and Reunion* (7s. 6d.); J. Bayldon, *Cyril Bardsley, Evangelist* (9s.); A. P. Carleton, *Society Natural and Divine* (6s.); C. M. Chavasse, *The Meaning of the Lessons and the Psalms* (6s.); E. Langton, *Good and Evil Spirits* (15s.); C. W. Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland* (7s. 6d.); W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Ministry and the Eucharist* (6s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher